X.

THE STUDY OF HISTORY

IN

HOLLAND AND BELGIUM

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN
HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

HERBERT B. ADAMS, Editor

History is past Politics and Politics present History — *Freeman*

EIGHTH SERIES

X

THE STUDY OF HISTORY
IN
HOLLAND AND BELGIUM

BY PAUL FRÉDÉRICQ
Professor in the University of Ghent

Authorized Translation from the French by Henrietta Leonard, of Philadelphia

BALTIMORE
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
OCTOBER, 1890

COPYRIGHT, 1890, BY N. MURRAY.

JOHN MURPHY & CO., PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

THE STUDY OF HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY IN HOLLAND..... 7

HISTORY IN BELGIUM..... 26

I.—Practical Course of the Normal Classical School at Liége (1852–1883)..... 29

II.—Prof. Kurth's Practical Course at the State University at Liége (1874–1883)..... 34

III.—Practical Course of M. Vanderkindere at the Free University of Brussels (1877–1879)..... 40

IV.—Practical Course of M. Philippson at the Free University of Brussels (1879–1883)..... 41

V.—Practical Course of Prof. Frédéricq at the State University of Liége (1880–1883)..... 44

VI.—Practical Course of Prof. Thomas at the State University of Ghent (1882–1883)..... 49

VII.—Practical Course of Prof. Motte at the State University of Ghent (1882–1883)..... 51

THE STUDY OF HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY IN HOLLAND.

In June, 1885, Leyden celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the installation of Prof. Robert Fruin, the most learned and most just of Dutch historians. His colleagues, old students and admirers from Holland, Belgium and the Dutch Indies, attempted to express in an informal ovation their high esteem and lively appreciation of the veteran. Finding myself at Leyden to attend the simple and touching ceremony, I made use of my stay in Holland to investigate the teaching of history there. The notes which follow, therefore, date back more than three years; but they have been brought down to the present moment, and I have completed them by investigations made in more recent visits.

I.

The Dutch law of 1876, regulating the organization of advanced teaching, provides that in the three State Universities at Leyden, Utrecht and Groningen, the Arts curriculum shall include the following historical subjects: (*a*) National History; (*b*) Universal History and Political Geography; (*c*) History of Jewish, Greek and Roman Antiquities. The last are taught by the professors of Hebrew, Greek and Latin. The remaining courses are divided between two professors, R. Fruin and P.

L. Muller at Leyden; Hecker and P. J. Blak at Groningen; but at Utrecht there is only one chair for all the branches of national and universal history, including ancient history, and that chair is occupied by Prof. J. A. Wijnne.[1]

The fourth university of Holland, that of Amsterdam, is not a State university, but a communal establishment. Its professors are chosen by ballot at the communal council, and the town of Amsterdam has exclusive charge of its budget. The curriculum is, with a few exceptions, the same as in the three State universities. Aside from the course in history and classical antiquities given by one of the professors of ancient philology, M. Valeton, Amsterdam, like Utrecht, has only one chair for national and universal history. This position is held by Prof. Th. Jorissen; but a course is given by Dr. Rogge, librarian of the university, as *lector*, a title equivalent to that of assistant professor in Belgium.

On the other hand, the teaching of geography is more complete at Amsterdam than at the other Dutch universities. This science has even a special chair, held by Prof. C. M. Kan, of European reputation.

Formerly, students of law and of theology had to take the historical course at the Faculty of Arts, and obtain the *testimonium*,[2] before taking the examinations in their own department. The law of 1876 remitted this, so that now the auditory of the history professors is composed of those students alone who are in the course for a doctor's degree in the Faculty of Arts. The doctor's degree is in Holland divided into five sections: doctor of philosophy, of classical literature, of Netherlandic literature (embracing Germanic philology), of Semitic literature, and of the literature of the Netherlandic Indies. But, strange to say, the Dutch legislature refused in 1876 to

---

[1] In 1885, M. Wijnne treated in his course the following subjects: Polybius; the Gracchi; Louis XI and his times; the attempt of William II of Orange upon Amsterdam and the reaction of the struggle.

[2] Our old attendance card "avec fruit" for the courses "à certificat."

institute a doctorate in history, although the creation of this degree was unanimously demanded by all the universities. It is, therefore, not in Belgium alone that the government manages to make itself detestable in matters of higher education.

The result has been fatal to history in the Dutch universities. While the division in the doctorate gave a new impetus to study of literature and ancient and modern philology, history, cinderella-like, has led for the last ten years a miserable existence. She has no students of her own, as have the other sciences of the Faculty of Arts. She is only the servant of the others. The students for the degree in classical literature attend the courses in history and Greek and Roman antiquities;[1] those for the degree in Germanic literature pursue the course in national and universal history; but all, especially those in the latter category, are overloaded with other courses more important for them and cannot devote themselves seriously to history. How could one wish that a student should take time to dip into history and be initiated in scientific method by history professors when he is plunged into the comparative grammar of Indo-Germanic languages, mediæval Netherlandish, Sanscrit, Gothic or Anglo-Saxon or Middle High German, as the case may be?[2]

There is thus in Holland no special preparation, I will not say for historians, but even for future professors of history and geography in the gymnasiums and *hoogere burgerscholen* which correspond to the two sections of our Belgian athenæums. Such professors are recruited, as best may be, from the doctors or fellows in classical philology or Germanic literature. Indeed, have *they* not taken some courses in history that have, from time to time, interrupted their deep literary and philological studies? Sometimes, also, they are recruited from among

[1] The course in ancient history of Oriental nations is taken only by future doctors in Semitic literature.

[2] See the remarkable rectoral address delivered at Leyden, 8th February, 1878, by Prof. Fruin. (Over de plaats die de geschiedenis in den kring der wetenschappen inneemt. Leyden, Brill, 1878).

those masters of preparatory schools who, by private study, with the aid of manuals of geography and history, obtain a diploma from the examining commission appointed by the state and sitting every year. Some of these masters of schools have also pursued a one year's course in national or universal history at the universities.

We have followed the same plan, with a few exceptions, in Belgium. We must not forget that it was only in 1880 that M. Van Humbuck created at Liége, and in 1884 at Ghent, the normal sections in history and geography. For the teaching of history and geography in our athenæums we had up to that time contented ourselves with the doctors of philosophy and the fellows in philology from the Normal Classical School, whose preparation in history was absolutely insufficient. However, the point is not yet gained. Since the change of ministry in June, 1884, it is noticeable that for the chairs in history at our athenæums doctors of philosophy from Louvain are preferred to specialists trained by the normal history section at Liége.

But to return to Holland. From the preceding it appears clear that there is almost no scientific study of history among the students for the doctorate in arts. But, curiously enough, this poor science, reduced to impotence in the Faculty of Arts, has taken refuge in another faculty where one would scarcely expect to see it better received—in the Faculty of Protestant Theology!

Under an impulse from W. Moll, professor of ecclesiastical history at Amsterdam, a school of history has been formed in Holland which has chosen for its field of exploration the religious life of the Netherlands from the time of the first apostles of Christianity down to our own day. Calm impartiality and rigorous scientific method are still the appanage of its two principal pupils, Prof. J. G. R. Acquoy of Leyden and J. G. de Hoop Scheffer of Amsterdam. Prof. Acquoy has in his turn become head of a school at Leyden.

We know that the Dutch doctor's degree is almost equivalent to our Belgian *doctorat spécial.* It is not only necessary to undergo oral examination before the assembled professors, which constitutes, entire, our examination for doctor of philosophy; but it is necessary, aside from this, to present a dissertation and to defend a certain number of theses. The preparation of this doctoral essay becomes, with good students, a serious scientific enterprise to which they often devote a couple of years and from which a book of the first order often follows. But this work is done under the direction of the professors with whom the future doctor is more particularly connected. Thus the master enters into direct intercourse with the student for many months, as initiator in scientific method and guide through the maze of bibliography and accumulated erudition.

At Leyden, Prof. Acquoy has found, from time to time, a pupil who, in his doctor's thesis, has uncovered a new point in the National religious history. Silenced in the Faculty of Arts, history has thus found an unlooked-for asylum with the theologians. It will therefore be interesting to study historical teaching in the Faculty of Theology as well as in that of Arts.

II.

The university building at Leyden is a Gothic structure of red and white stone, formerly a nunnery. It is not large, but it does not lack charm and is picturesquely situated near an old bridge over a pretty canal, the *Rapenburg*, which is shaded on both banks by ancient trees. Entering the *Academiegebouw* one comes first to the imposing *Aula*, an old chapel, sparingly decorated in the most elegant style of the Dutch renaissance; then to the old staircase with its allegorical crayon-frescoes, religiously preserved, representing scenes in student life, the work of a Leyden man who is to-day a personage of note, M. de Stuers. On the second floor is the hall which contains a portrait of William the Silent, founder of the university,

and 150 portraits in oil of celebrated professors, such as Scaliger, Arminius, van der Palm and Thorbecke; and for the Flemings among the first masters of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries read the Latin inscriptions in gilt letters underneath these venerable heads: *Walaeus Gandavensis, Bonaventura Vulcanius Brugensis,* as well as others who found a refuge in the emancipated provinces of the North and brought there their talent and their science, to be irrevocably lost to us in consequence of the triumphs of Spain in Belgium.

After visiting these historic halls the stranger is taken to three or four old auditoriums, one of which has fine Gothic vaulting, supported by handsome pillars.

But evidently this building is too cramped and too old for the requirements of a university of the first order, such as Leyden always has been and still is. Where then are all the courses given which are enumerated in the *Series lectionum in Universitate Lugduno-Batava?*

Formerly each professor had a large room in his house where he gave his lectures. The custom is not yet wholly extinct, but various laboratories and auditoriums have been built in divers parts of the town. Many of the courses in the Faculty of Arts are given in a modest but spacious house near the university, opposite the ancient church of St. Peter, where Count William of Holland, who was emperor of Germany in the 13th century, was baptized. In the Middle Ages Leyden was the capital and center of Holland, while Rotterdam, Amsterdam and The Hague were only second in rank.

Professor Fruin keeps to the ancient custom, and gives his lectures at his house. A few moments before the hour stated in the program, the door of the house is left open and the students enter one by one, passing through the corridor and gliding unobtrusively into the lecture-room. This room is a very simple one, looking out upon an interior court, and having for furniture only four benches and a chair painted in light yellow. Before the lecture M. Fruin had received me in his parlor, and chatted with that distinguished simplicity

and slightly cool reserve but charming good-nature, which characterize him. Then he drew out his watch, remarked that it was time, and opened a door leading into the bare hall where the students were waiting. I seated myself on the first bench and the lecture began.

M. Fruin occupies the chair of national history, to which he has for the last quarter of a century brought great renown. As this was the first time he had met his students since the demonstration in his honor, he began with a few words of acknowledgment to the young men who had joined in the celebration. Circumspect applause greeted this little preamble. Then M. Fruin entered upon the situation of the Republic of the United Provinces in 1660. There were nine students present.

M. Fruin stated and criticised the commercial policy of the Grand Pensionary de Witt, the intrigues of the diplomacy of Louis XIV, the attitude of England and the part played by William III of Orange. He frequently read extracts from contemporary writings, Mignet's *Documents de la succession d'Espagne*, and other collections. From time to time he paused to take in his hand a sheet of paper, upon which he had noted, in a cramped handwriting, the points he wished to make; then he began upon a new aspect of the question, always in a calm, even tone, like a judge pronouncing sentence, without studied expressions, but with admirable clearness and precision. It was evident that he was a master imparting the results of long research and cool meditation, without pretension or display, but with a serious simplicity which had in it something of solemnity.

The part which struck me most in this masterly lecture was that devoted to the situation of our Belgian provinces at the end of the seventeenth century. The Grand Pensionary de Witt dreamed of making the Spanish Netherlands an independent Catholic Republic, which would have been the sure ally of the Protestant Republic of the United Provinces. Before him Oldenbarnevelt had already had the idea of adding to the Protestant states an independent Belgium, having for

its Catholic *stadhouder* that other son of William the Silent, Philip William, whom the Duke of Alba had had brought up at the University of Louvain and who had received a Spanish education. In our day this Dutch diplomacy of the seventeenth century has been realized in its broad outline: Catholic Belgium lives side by side and on the best terms with Protestant Holland, and the two *stadhouders*, closely united notwithstanding their religious and political disagreements, are the Kings Leopold II and William III. M. Fruin developed his views clearly and cleverly, forcing nothing, making no words, with severe impartiality, even criticising the diplomacy of the United Provinces which Guizot and other contemporary historians have too much exalted at the expense of the French diplomacy, which was under Louis XIV the first in Europe.

The next day I took care not to miss the lecture, in which M. Fruin dealt with the commercial questions that played so great a part in the Dutch policy of that time. For this war of tariffs the professor referred to Clément's work on Colbert, which, although dating back already more than forty years, remains the most solid book upon the subject. Then he himself set forth with a profusion of picturesque details, figures and estimates, the vital importance to Holland of those prohibitive duties with which Colbert and Cromwell loaded the commerce and marine of the United Provinces. The Dutch merchants were not only better fitted out but also more clearsighted than those of the rest of Europe. Proof of this fact is found in the writings of Pierre de la Court, the Dutch precursor of Adam Smith, in the seventeenth century, and in the numerous commercial reports of the times, which are preserved in the archives at The Hague. M. Fruin has studied them with scrupulous care and gave numerous extracts. He commented especially upon the opinions of Jacob Clouck, an Amsterdam merchant, who, in 1657, in a barbarous style, recommended free trade and summed up his views in the quite modern phrase: "*Het eenighe interest van Holland is vryheyt in de commercie.*" Less clearsighted and more selfish were

the councils of Amsterdam and Rotterdam, in which sat the rich patricians who had great interests in the traffic in French wines. M. Fruin drew a strikingly clear picture of the confused strife of opposing interests in Holland, France and England, using only trustworthy documents, many of which are, I think, known to him alone, and using them at first hand.

Listening to these admirable lectures I could not help feeling regret at the exaggerated diffidence which causes M. Fruin to resist all the entreaties of his friends and former pupils that he should publish his course. So much research, such an acquaintance with the documents of the time and with all the literature on the subject, added to an extraordinary faculty of discovering the truth, and stating it without partiality and with lofty simplicity, all these rare qualifications of the historian are not given to a man without imposing upon him the duty of using them to construct a great scientific edifice, especially when all the stones are ready. Since the fine book which established his reputation and brought him to the chair at Leyden (*Tien jaren uit den tachtig-jarigen vorlog*, 1588–1598), M. Fruin has produced only detached monographs, some of which are masterpieces, but which certainly do not give his full measure; for still more than his writings, does his oral teaching make one feel the master.

I was not able to attend the free course which M. Fruin has given, if I am not mistaken, every two years upon the history of national institutions. The first year he takes up the political machinery of the Netherlands in the Middle Ages and up to the sixteenth century; the third year that of the brilliant Republic of the seventeenth century; the fifth year that of the eighteenth century and to the present time. Here, too, he must have all the materials gathered for a capital work which would fill a real gap in the historical literature of Holland.

Prof. P. L. Muller occupies the so-called chair of general history, which, according to the law, includes also political geography. He is a pupil of M. Fruin, and M. Blok, who

occupies the same chair at Groningen, is another favorite disciple.

M. Muller divides his work into three courses. In one he gives detached chapters of the history of the Middle Ages and modern times (*capita selecta historiæ*), such as: the sources of Mediæval history up to Charlemagne; some parts of the life of the great Frank emperor; some episodes of the French Revolution of 1789. In the second he studies a single period of European history in modern times. In the third, he takes up political and historical geography.

When I was at Leyden in 1885, M. Muller, in his course in *capita selecta historiæ*, in which he had three students, was speaking of the French Revolution. He constantly compared von Sybel to Taine and clearly defined the amount of credence to be accorded to the principal historians of the great revolution. His practical advice to his students was to read, first of all, von Sybel's admirable book, then Thiers, Louis Blanc, etc., so as to note how partial the latter are. M. Muller frequently read long extracts from von Sybel in German, a proceeding which would be impossible with our Belgian students.

In modern history, M. Muller was occupied with the war of the succession in Spain. I heard him discuss the merits and defects of the great works of Mignet and von Noorden. The colonial policy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the decline of Spain, the conquests of Louis XIV and the state of feeling in Alsace, Flanders and Hainault at the time of their annexation, the toll-system, etc., were treated by the professor with great clearness and solid acquaintance with the subject. M. Muller often referred to the physical and historical maps, a rich collection of which was at his disposal. He had four pupils.

These maps naturally form an indispensable instrument of a course in political geography. M. Muller was at that time dealing with Brittany and the basin of the Charente. He related first, in broad outline, all the vicissitudes through which

the population of these regions had passed, from the Celtic period down to our day; he expatiated upon the commercial importance of the regions, as well as upon the Breton and Vendean ports, and presented a complete picture of the physical and moral situation of the country. This geography lecture was very full and very precise, evidently inspired by the method of Elyseé Reclus. Here, also, there were four students.

On account of the small number of auditors, almost all candidates for the doctorate in Netherlandic literature, these courses have quite a familiar character. They are given in a modest room in the first *étage* of an old house formerly occupied by officers of the Dutch Indies and now rented to the University. A desk of wood, painted in imitation of oak, tables of the same color and a dozen convenient and comfortable chairs, together with the maps that tapestry the walls, constitute the furniture. Through the large windows can be seen the buttresses and high pointed arches of the church of St. Peter and the leaves of the trees which meet over the ancient church yard. One could fancy himself in a Flemish nunnery.

On the ground floor of the University, in a great Gothic hall whose arches rest upon elegant columns, Prof. Acquoy gives his course in ecclesiastical history. In spite of his white hair, M. Acquoy is still very vigorous, and is distinguished for his animated teaching, full of humor and good nature. I heard him describe the state of schools and libraries at the time of Charlemagne. There were about ten listeners, students of theology. The lecture was a charming chat, in which the most vast and varied learning reproduced with truly picturesque touches the intellectual situation in the West in the year 800. One would have thought a contemporary was speaking of what he had seen with his own eyes. After attending his lecture I understood the sympathy with which this modest and amiable scholar inspires his pupils, rosy as he is, freshly shaven and framed in his silver beard, with a courteous and cordial manner, an expression full of goodness, a delivery at

once engaging and sparkling with wit and fine fancy. Even more than his own books, the works of his pupils witness the productiveness and the value of his teaching.

III.

After Leyden I visited Amsterdam.

The university there occupies the monumental structure of the ancient hospital for old men, which contained the famous museum of Van der Hoop before the construction of the splendid Gothic palace where almost all the artistic wealth of the Dutch capital is now collected.

The faculty of arts has a beautiful professor's hall adorned with old portraits of Hooft, Vondel, etc. There I found Prof. Théodore Jorissen, who occupies the chair of history, and whose course especially attracted me to Amsterdam. M. Jorissen has not the teaching of geography among his functions, as have his colleagues in the three other Dutch universities. He gives two courses, one of which, history of the Middle Ages, extends over two academic years. In 1883–84 he had lectured on mediæval history up to the crusades; in 1884–85 he had treated the history of the crusades and was, at the time of my visit, finishing a detailed parallel between the preparation for monarchical centralization in France and the origin of parliamentarism in England.

I was present at three lectures. There were six students, who took a great many notes. M. Jorissen reviewed the history of the Great Charter of England in the thirteenth century and the history of France at the same period. He spoke in a vibrating tone, walking about in the hall. The room was furnished with a long row of ugly benches, painted black, as in our Belgian lecture-rooms. But the gloom of the room was lightened by a smiling view through the windows of a beautiful interior court, planted with great, leafy trees. M. Jorissen was nearly at the end of his course and gave his conclusions in broad lines, sketching roughly the principal facts,

to corroborate his view of this decisive period in France and England. He spoke almost without consulting his notes, pacing the hall and playing with his eyeglasses. His warm and earnest manner showed a man sure of his facts and a scientific temperament of energy and authority.

M. Jorissen devoted his second course to the history of Netherlandic institutions and extended it over two academic years. In 1883–84, after an introduction on the constituent elements of the people of the ancient Netherlands, he had given the history of their means of existence: agriculture, manufacture, commerce and shipping. Then he had traced the origin and development of the towns and provinces. In 1884–85 he was engaged upon leading institutions: States-General, Council of State, administration of finances, land and sea forces, diplomacy, *stadhoudérat*. In the two lectures which I attended he was dealing with the last subject. He traced the struggle, as much secret as open, which the jealousies of patrician families kept up against the house of Orange, characterizing clearly the role of de Witt and William III, bringing in the famous struggle of this great prince against Louis XIV, his armies and his diplomacy. As at Leyden it was the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which played the principal part in the course on national history. M. Jorissen handled the subject with great clearness and with the seriousness which it deserves, delighting to hunt down ideas and scrutinize principles and pronouncing his clear judgments in energetic style. His course is fascinating and profoundly suggestive.

The librarian of the University, Dr. H. C. Rogge, completes this history teaching by a course which I could not attend, but which he described to me with the most amiable readiness. This course is given especially for those who desire to obtain the certificate (*acto van het middelbaar onderwijs*) for teaching history and geography in the *hoogere burgerscholen*, almost equivalent to the professional section of our Belgian athenæums. In 1885 M. Rogge had a dozen students. The course extends over two

years. In the first year it treats of subjects of general history. M. Rogge explains the methodology of history, neglecting the matter, and indicates for each period, summarily discussing them, sources and principal works. Twice a week he gives a lecture of two hours, with an intermission of fifteen minutes, during which the students rapidly look through the books of which the professor is going to speak and which he has had laid out for them upon a large table. As the course is given in the library, this is easy to arrange. The students thus make immediate acquaintance with the works whose value they are to learn—an excellent way of vivifying the bibliographical information which it is so difficult to fix in the minds of students. They turn over the leaves curiously, look through the table of contents and do not forget so easily the books they have had in their hands.

The second year M. Rogge goes more deeply into certain periods of universal history, for example: The Peloponnesian war, the Ottos, the emperors of the Holy Empire, William III of Orange in Holland and England, Frederick II of Prussia. At each lecture, after a brief statement of certain great facts, he gives details of the principal sources, names the great works, compares the methods followed by modern historians who have treated the same subjects, cites characteristic pages of their works, refers to important discussions which have appeared in special reviews, etc. During a pause of quarter of an hour the books and articles mentioned are again put within reach of the students. This system inspires them with a taste for historical reading, and they are all constant *habitués* of the library.

M. Rogge explained his original plan of procedure with quite youthful enthusiasm. I am convinced that he must exercise a strong influence upon his students, and that his course renders them valuable service.

Of the four Dutch universities, that at Amsterdam alone, has any complete geographical instruction, with a special titular professor. This professor is M. C. M. Kan, who gives to

the work eight hours a week. About twenty students take the course each year. They are chiefly candidates for the certificate for *hoogere burgerscholen*. Among them are also found students of law and medicine, who purpose to enter the service of the colonies, and occasionally one meets an amateur. These students have at their disposal the best maps, the most important special books, Dutch and foreign, as well as almost all the existing geographical reviews, which they find in the library of the University, together with all the collections and publications of the *Aardrijkskundig Genootschap* of Amsterdam. A little fee of eighty florins (about $34) is given to the professor, who has exclusive use of two large halls, one for lectures and the other for collections. The complete cycle of this geographical teaching requires not less than three years.

First there is a course in physical geography, two hours a week. For the first year M. Kan studies the earth from the point of view of orography, hydrography, geological formation and topography, and explains the principles of the lecture by means of charts. The second year he devotes to seas and coasts. The third year he takes up questions of ethnography and detached chapters of political and social geography, such as density of population, the characters of human races and their distribution upon our globe, the connection between physical geography and the political and moral condition of nations, colonization, religions and their influence upon the different human races, etc.

A second course of two hours a week, which is kept up for three years, is devoted to a deeper study of the Dutch colonies.

In a third course of two hours a week for three years, M. Kan gives a history of geographical discovery.

The fourth course, of one hour a week, is devoted to methodological exercises in intermediate teaching. The students learn to prepare and give lessons in geography of the grade given in the institutions where they will later teach.

The fifth course of one hour a week consists of meetings at which each student in his turn states the result of his personal

researches upon a subject given out six weeks in advance; for example: What is actually known of the Blue Nile? What are the best works upon this river and the best maps of it? The student's discussion must not last more than forty minutes; then the professor gives a detailed and severe criticism of it.

M. Kan, who is a doctor of literature and does not belong to the faculty of science, is assisted by colleagues from that faculty in the more special parts. Prof. J. H. van't Hoff gives a short course in dynamical geography, the constitution of volcanoes, their eruptions, the formation of glaciers, etc. Dr. C. Kerbert, *lector* of the University, gives some notion of botanical and zoölogical geography. Prof. D. J. Korteweg sometimes adds to this program a course in astronomical geography. To each of these courses one hour a week is devoted.

To sum up, the students who take geography at Amsterdam thus have, according to the year, ten or twelve hours a week in that science, which is completely excluded from higher teaching in Belgium, except at Liège, where it figures in the program as an optional course. It is true that there is also a course in commercial and industrial geography at the mining school at Liège and at the school of arts and manufactures at Ghent.

IV.

The preceding notes will suffice, I think, to give an idea of the state of history and geography in the Dutch universities.

We have seen that political and historical geography form part of the program of the Faculty of Arts at Leyden, Utrecht and Groningen, and that in Amsterdam the teaching of geography, in the hands of a specialist of unquestionable ability, is organized in a very remarkable and complete manner.

But history is undeservedly sacrificed. Excluded from the rank of a specialty with a doctorate, it has not a proper number of students. The discouraged professors, among whom

are scholars of the very first order, are contented with giving the theoretical courses which the law requires and cannot think of initiating into scientific methods hearers who are occupied with other things. In consequence of a mistake in the law of 1876 relative to higher teaching, a mistake which was, however, pointed out to the legislature in good time by the four universities, history seems condemned to remain sterile, while all the other departments of the Faculty of Arts flourish and bear fruit.

In 1879, the hope was for an instant cherished of putting an end to the ostracism of history from the higher teaching of Holland. At that time the minister, Kappeyne, presented to the Lower House of the States-General a bill, one of the articles of which created a doctorate in history.

In stating his motives, M. Kappeyne spoke concisely and very justly: "History occupies an important place in intermediate instruction. More than any other subject it needs professors who have a strictly scientific method. It is necessary that this instruction, which loses all its value if it be reduced to a mere enumeration of dates and facts, should be made in their hands an important factor of the intellectual development of the pupil. It must, therefore, be considered, if not a fault, at least an oversight not to have created a separate doctorate in history, when the law relating to higher education was passed.

"The Faculty of Arts and Philosophy consists of three categories of sciences: the philological, the philosophical and the historical. The absence of a doctorate in history is a deficiency in the provision of the law, and is perhaps only a mistake."

When M. Kappeyne's bill was discussed at the session of February 26, 1879, no objection to the creation of the doctorate was raised; but when the House voted upon the bill as a whole it was defeated by a majority, and the poor doctorate was buried, to wait for a new administration.

But is it enough to fold the arms and wait for the distant day when the law will be revised? Cannot the initiative of

a professor in part repair the fault committed twice in succession by the legislature?

M. P. J. Blok, professor of history at Groningen since 1884, thought it could be done. In 1885–86 he boldly opened a practical course (*privaat-college*) and renewed the attempt in 1887-88 with success.

The plan of this historical work is as follows: Once a week M. Blok meets the amateurs for a couple of hours in his study. After an introduction by the professor, which takes a dozen meetings and is devoted to an examination of the principal sources for the Middle Ages and to giving some notion of diplomacy, the students are each charged with the study of some special subject. In 1887–88 the subjects chosen were: the value of the chronicle of Alpertus Mettensis in regard to the events which took place near Nimeguen at the commencement of the eleventh century; the foundation of Dordrecht; the assassination of Count Florent V of Holland; the determination of the period at which the popular language began to be used in the charters of the Netherlands; the elevation of Count William II of Holland to imperial dignity. Each student gives in his work, written, and the professor hands it over to another student, who is charged to make a written criticism of it. Finally M. Blok himself criticises both manuscripts in presence of all the students and the disputed points are discussed in common.

In the intervals between the discussions, professor and students investigate in detail some point of local history. In 1887–88 this investigation bore upon the office of burgrave at Groningen in the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The registrar of the province put at M. Blok's disposal all the documents in his depository and from these unedited papers the work of the course was done. The students copied the papers one after another as they examined them, and were thus initiated at the same time into paleography.

This practical course, which has each year consisted of about ten amateurs, has already contributed to form some specialists who have taken places in the administration of records.

Such is, I think, the true course, which it is necessary to accept boldly. To wait amiably till the House has acquired a precise idea of the scientific needs of advanced study is to lose precious time and to expect the impossible. The universities must be helped by the professors themselves, not by fatally incompetent legislators, whose votes are often more to be dreaded than to be desired.

In Belgium the professors of history are impressed with this truth. They have created practical courses which have raised the level of historical teaching. I am convinced that it will be the same in Holland, if the good example of M. Blok at Groningen is followed in the three remaining universities. In the course of the last two years, even in the very heart of the Faculty of Arts at Leyden and Groningen, there has appeared a phenomenon which seems to augur a better future for the scientific study of history: at Leyden there have been two doctors in Germanic philology, and at Groningen a third, who have treated historical subjects in their doctor's theses. The creation of practical courses in history seems thus to be inevitable.

THE STUDY OF HISTORY IN BELGIUM.

It can scarcely be said that advanced study of history exists in Belgium. This science, cultivated and honored as it is abroad, is by the Belgian law relegated to the course in philosophy; that is to say, history is studied in our universities only by students of the first year, who are generally very ill prepared and who for the most part are in haste to go through the Faculties of arts and philosophy as quickly as possible in order to begin law. Even the few pupils who do not leave the department at the end of several months and who are studying for a doctorate in philosophy, never hear history spoken of except incidentally in the courses in literature or languages and in lectures on Greek antiquities.[1]

This neglect of history during the years devoted to the doctorate in philosophy is one of the most shocking absurdities of our miserable law. It is hard to see what motive could have guided the legislator, if indeed the question so much as presented itself to him.

The teaching of history in the philosophical course is of necessity elementary. It comprises, moreover, only general courses in ancient history (Greek and Roman), history of the Middle Ages, modern history and, since Easter, 1880, contemporary history. Besides this, tradition establishes that the

[1] M. Vanderkindere (*Revue de Belgique*, May 15th, 1880,) has described the situation in a few words: "History is the Cinderella of the family; she is shut up in the department of philosophy and locked out of the doctorate."

professor shall cover the whole subject in a few lectures each year, thus reducing his teaching to a general statement, such as is found in manuals.[1] M. Michel Bréal, who has visited the Belgium universities and whose rare competency is well known, rightly said of our faculty of philosophy: "The professors are obliged to repeat almost the same course every year and they can scarcely rise above the level of the upper classes in our colleges."[2] Likewise one of our most distinguished professors of history, M. Vanderkindere, expressed what everybody is thinking when he said: "With us the professor is condemned to travel continually around the same circle; like a machine, he repeats the same work, perhaps for thirty years. Having once written his course, provided he keeps it up with the times, his work is done. For the man of science this is actual degradation; he loses his true character, which is that of creator and innovator, and falls with broken spirit from higher teaching to intermediate."[3]

There is nothing more disastrous in its effect both upon teachers and upon pupils. Says M. Paul Thomas,[4] the learned professor of ancient history at Ghent: "Let us suppose that a professor keeps carefully abreast of the times, does original work, makes discoveries; the most extensive and conscientious research will merely permit him to introduce here and there in his lectures modifications which will pass unnoticed by his students. The means by which he acquired the ideas and

[1] M. Vanderkindere, in the article cited above, said further: "But at least the undergraduates have a better chance and their study of history is more adequate? Not at all. All the branches are crowded together into a single examination. The pupil studies ancient, mediæval, modern history and history of Belgium without stopping to take breath; he strides through this immense domain, where he ought to study the operation of the political and social evolution of humanity, with monstrous haste; he makes his 'tour of the world in eighty days.'"

[2] *Revue Scientifique*, August 2d, 1879. Reprinted in *Revue de l'instruction publique de Belgique*, Vol. XXII, p. 274.

[3] Article cited above.

[4] *De la réorganisation des Facultés de philosophie et lettres en Belgique.* (Ghent, 1880.)

the new facts will never occur to them; and, to tell the truth, it would interest them little and profit them less, since they have neither taste nor means nor time to undertake similar work. Nothing is more enervating to men of science, nothing more opposed to progress than this compulsory dogmatism. A man must be gifted with a great deal of energy to resist the encroachments of torpor, and to keep up his vigor and self-control."

This is so true that, as a rule, the professors of history in our universities publish less than do most of the archivists or even certain dilettanti.[1] There are even some who have never published anything at all, and who content themselves with imperturbably reading their notes to each new generation of students whom the years bring to their feet.

Why is it that the advanced teaching of history is so rigorous and scientific in Germany and at Paris, and so dead in our Belgian universities? From a multitude of causes, to be sure; but the principal one is that *practical* teaching of history is almost unknown among us.

Before setting out for Berlin in 1881, I was thoroughly convinced of the absolute necessity of practical courses in history, as is proved by my attempt to make one at Liége. My conviction has not been weakened by what I saw in Berlin, Halle, Leipzig, Göttingen and Paris; it has on the contrary become firmer, more eager still to see the teaching of history in Belgium regenerated by the adoption and generalization of the practical method.

The method indeed made its appearance some years ago in our higher courses, without noise, almost timidly and without attracting much attention from the government or the academic authorities. It has seemed to me interesting to note where

[1] M. Vanderkindere is struck also with this significant phenomenon: "In Germany all the great masters have their schools; in Belgium, for some strange reason, our most laborious and most authoritative historians, Wauters, Juste, Gachard, Kervyn, Hénaux, de Gerlache, etc., have never been professors; they are archivists, scholars, who have never trained a pupil."

this movement has taken place, which, though still modest will, if generalized, revolutionize the scientific study of history.

I.

Practical Course of the Normal Classical School at Liége (1852–1883).

My friend and colleague, M. Kurth, in 1876, called attention to the fact that it is to the Normal Classical School at Liége that we must look for the first embryonic existence in Belgium of those methods which have for fifty years constituted the chief power of the higher teaching of history in Germany.

M. Kurth gave an account of a visit he had made to the German universities in 1874. .Speaking of the practical course of Prof. Droysen, at Berlin, he said: "M. Droysen, in his Historical Society, keeps to written works because they seem to him to give more consistency to study and something to start from; they more easily furnish an object of discussion; they show better a pupil's degree of power, as well as his scientific aptitude; and they allow his fellow-student to profit more by his work. The correction of this work is entrusted to another pupil who, under the professor's direction, criticises its errors and discusses it with the author at the next meeting; hence arise controversies that are often very animated, in which each one present may take part and which present an appearance of real scientific life. I may remark that this method is likewise followed in our Normal Classical School, an excellent institution which rivals similar ones in Germany and France and which, though not perfect, could often serve as a model for reforms in our universities."[1]

A royal order of September, 1852, had hardly detached the Normal School from the University of Liége, making it an

[1] *Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique*, Vol. XIX, p. 89.

independent institution, with a three years' course, when in October following, a ministerial order inserted among the practical courses of the third year, "essays and exercises upon historical subjects (two hours per week during the entire year)."[1] This practical course in history, an unprecedented innovation for Belgium, was given to the charge of M. Borgnet, professor of history at the University of Liége, and he retained it until 1872 when he was declared emeritus. Beginning with 1856, a fourth year having been added to the Normal School course, the practical work in history was carried on through this last year. The object was to send out from the school professors fitted to teach history in the athenæums and colleges.

This was an insufficient preparation for good professors of history. Finally the Government comprehended the fact. In 1880 a special section for history and geography was created in the Normal School.[2] But the course in "essays and exer-

[1] Triennial Report upon the state of intermediate teaching in Belgium, 1852–1854, p. 219.

[2] By a royal decision of Nov. 9, 1880, confirmed by a ministerial decision of the following day. So far as I know, the government did not consult a single professor of history before creating this history section at the Normal School. Thus, it is very incomplete. It consists of but a two years' course, which is entirely insufficient. It teaches neither paleography, diplomacy, epigraphy, archæology nor the history of historiography. It possesses no practical course organized by the government; it is only another course of historical essays and exercises upon the Orient, Rome and Greece, like that of 1852.

It is true that the students of the history section have been privileged to attend my practical course at the University. I was much flattered by the honor, but as my course is free and independent of official sanction, I can close it to-day or to-morrow and, in strictness, refuse to admit the pupils whom the minister has bestowed upon me without consulting me. The University of Liége has another practical course in history of the Middle Ages (M. Kurth's) to which it would be useful to send the pupils of the Normal School history section, who are truly not injured by practical exercises.

In any case, it is imperatively necessary to proceed to the complete reorganization of the history section, which is still only a rough attempt. As it is, the students are overloaded with work, literally overwhelmed during the two years; they leave the school just as they have begun to see a little into the methods of history and to get some benefit from their study, which may be compared to forced culture.

cises upon historical subjects," instituted in 1852, remained for more than twenty years the only practical course in history which Belgium possessed.[1]

I took this course the last year of Prof. Borgnet's career. The regretted scholar had devoted himself especially to modern and national history; his fine works upon Belgium at the end of the eighteenth century, and the revolution at Liége in 1789, are well known, but he paid little attention to ancient history. Nevertheless the practical course was confined entirely to Greek and Roman antiquity, probably for the sake of indirectly subserving the principal studies of the Normal students, who put classical philology before everything.

My personal recollections of what the course was in 1870–71, are as follows: We recited in turn, and orally, the principal events of Greek and Roman history according to Curtius, Mommsen, Duruy, etc. The professor, who was not a specialist in ancient history, did not require of us personal and critical investigation, so that these exercises in "historical elocution" were not a very scientific influence. Every three months we had to write an essay upon some subject from ancient history indicated by Prof. Borgnet. These essays, corrected by a student under the direction of the professor, were not objects of very deep study.

In short, this practical course left something to be desired. How much more fruitful it would have been, on the contrary, if Prof. Borgnet had made us work upon those epochs whose sources and vexed questions he knew so well. However, notwithstanding their insufficiency, these historical essays and exercises were a hundred times better than nothing, for they required personal work and tended to rouse the critical spirit far more than any theoretical course in history at the Faculty of Arts.

---

[1] Through an unjustifiable administrative eccentricity, the Normal School is confined to intermediate teaching; its organization and its spirit would class it with institutions for higher teaching.

In October, 1872, Prof. Troisfontaines succeeded Prof. Borgnet, and since 1880–81 these practical exercises have been taken by the students in the history section, and those of the fourth year in ancient languages. I give a short summary of the working of the course for the last few years under Prof. Troisfontaines. Each week some designated student discusses for about an hour, with the aid of a few notes, a subject which may be either chosen by him or indicated by the professor. His fellow-students and the professor take notes upon what he advances so as to put objections to him at the following meeting. This meeting is devoted entirely to the critical discussion, the students making their observations first and the professor afterward complementing, correcting and explaining the weak points. The questions thus developed orally for an hour bear upon the prehistoric period (two or three meetings), history of the East, of Greece and of Rome. For the Stone Age and oriental history they depend upon the principal works of recent scholarship. For Greece and Rome the student is obliged to go to the sources, citing them and discussing them. Some of the subjects of the last few years are as follows: Man during the Stone Age; the primitive Aryans; Brahmanism; Buddhism; Mazdeism; character of political and social institutions of ancient Egypt; character of the institutions of Vedic India according to the recent work of M. Zimmer (1880); Greece in Homeric times; the league of Delos and the tribute of the allies according to inscriptions; the career of Theramenes according to Thucydides, Lysius, etc.; ancient currencies; Philip of Macedon; Alexander the Great; Greece in the time of the Romans; the origin of Rome; Mommsen's view of Caius Gracchus; Mommsen's opinion of the character and reforms of Sulla; Mommsen's judgment of Cæsar; Gaul before the Roman invasion; the principal Roman emperors (several meetings).

Every three months each student produces a written paper upon a subject of his own choice or one suggested by the professor. The professor furnishes necessary hints in regard to

ancient sources, Greek and Roman inscriptions and modern works upon the subjects. If there is occasion he acquaints them with inscriptions recently discovered.[1] The style of the papers must be very clear and careful; all rhetoric and all generalization without proof is severely rejected. Corrections are made in common under the direction of the professor.

I cite here some of the subjects of the papers during late years: Critical history of ostracism; The career of Cleon, taking account of the comments of Aristophanes and Thucydides; Since what time were the Archons chosen by lot? Does the silence of certain ancient writers (Herodotus, Xenophon and Aristotle) permit the argument that equality of property never existed among the Spartans? Till what time did the government called that of the Five-thousand last at Athens? What was the essence of the reform of Clisthenes? How far can Attic comedy be taken as a source of history? Debts of the plebeians in the early days of the Roman republic; Critical study of the life of Nero according to Tacitus; Did Nero set fire to Rome? How far are the accusations against Julia Domna to be believed? Find all that concerns her in the inscriptions.

The professor, from time to time, conducts also a critical analysis of ancient sources, such as the first book of Livy, and the lives of Tiberius and Nero in Tacitus.

M. Troisfontaines has, besides this, since 1880–81, given a course in historical methodology, consisting of about ten lectures upon sources, laws of history, rules of historical criticism and the sciences auxiliary to history.

Such is in brief the origin and development of the "essays and exercises" organized thirty years ago at the Normal Classical School at Liége. But this institution is entirely dis-

[1] M. Troisfontaines, in 1872, requested the establishment of a course in epigraphy at the Normal School. In 1881–82 M. Adolph de Ceuleneer, now of the Faculty of Philosophy at Ghent, gave a free course on epigraphy at Liége, with great success. The normalists attended it well. In 1882–83 he introduced the same instruction at Ghent with equal success.

tinct from the University at its side and does not at all relieve the administration of advanced instruction. Since its establishment in 1852 it has been attached to the administration of intermediate instruction.

It is, however, the only state institution in which the government has itself organized a practical course in history. I am sure it was done without premeditation in 1852 and that the government is entirely innocent of the good results thereby produced.

II.

Prof. Kurth's Practical Course at the State University at Liége (1874–1883).

The honor of having introduced the practical course in history into our universities belongs to my colleague at Liége, M. Godefroid Kurth, professor of mediæval history. In consequence of a visit made to the universities of Leipzig, Berlin and Bonn,[1] he started in 1874–75 the first course of practical historical work attempted by a Belgian Faculty of Philosophy. After two years of experiment he gave us the course as it is to-day.

Prof. Kurth aimed to exclude weak and mediocre members and considered five or six students the maximum number. The students engaged to remain faithful to the work for at least two years, but they did not all keep their word; several, however, followed the course for three and even four years. All the members were university students, in the arts, for the doctor's degree, or in law. The class is divided into two sections, each section meeting once a week for an hour and a

[1] See M. Kurth's interesting notes upon his visit, published in the *Revue de l'instr.* (1876, Vol. XIX, pp. 88–100), entitled *De l'enseignement de l'histoire en Allemagne.* He speaks specially of the practical courses of Voigt, Wuttke and Brandes at Leipzig; Nitzsch, Ern. Curtius and Droysen at Berlin.

half or two hours. The meeting of the second section lasts sometimes three hours. The strictest attendance is required, and if a pupil is obliged to be absent he must inform the professor beforehand.

In the section of beginners the course is essentially the same every year. There is first an introduction by the professor in regard to the nature and aim of the practical work. M. Kurth then states the fundamental principles of historical criticism, chiefly according to the excellent dissertations of the Jesuit Father De Smedt, lately collected into one volume.[1] He then gives a general idea of the bibliography of history, as well as more precise information in regard to the bibliography of the subject to be taken up the following year in the advanced course. After this introduction the first work in analysis of sources is begun. Each lecture is divided into two parts: first the professor gives certain bibliographical hints and criticisms; then they go on to the analysis and critical discussion of some document or source of history presented by a pupil who has been designated beforehand by the professor and has prepared himself at leisure. Toward the end of the year the students sometimes write little critical papers. In 1882–83 M. Kurth allowed his best pupil, M. Henri Pirenne, to give this entire preparatory course under his direction.

In the second section they take up a special subject for thorough study, investigating all the sources. Each view of the question is made the topic of a written paper, either by a student or by the professor. Some of the subjects thus studied since 1874 are as follows: Critical studies upon the sources of history of Lotharingia; upon the sources of history of the Barbarians; upon the hagiography of Liége in the seventh and eighth centuries (for two years); upon sources of history of the district of Liége (for three years). Next year (1884) M. Kurth proposes to take up the sources of history of Char-

[1] *Principes de la Critique historique.* (Liége and Paris, 1883.) I cannot too strongly recommend this book to all young students of history.

lemagne. The memoirs which M. Kurth has published upon St. Remacle,[1] St. Lambert,[2] Gregory of Tours,[3] St. Servais[4] and the origin of the city of Liége[5] were first written in view of this course and read to his students.

Two of the students have published studies worked out in M. Kurth's practical course: M. Leon Lahaye, an essay upon "The Normans in the Diocese of Liége;"[6] and M. Henri Pirenne, a monograph upon "Sedulius of Liége."[7]

I give also some detailed information upon M. Kurth's excellent course, leaving to one side the preparatory section. In 1875–76 the advanced section consisted of only two students, but they were full of zeal. The work was upon the sources of history of Lotharingia. They made special study of the principal annals, such as those of Fulda, Laurisheim, St. Vaast, St. Bertin, Prudence of Troyes, Hincmar and Réginon from the point of view of the events which have had Lotharingia for their theater. It was in connection with this course that M. Lahaye, one of the students, wrote the study upon the invasion of the Normans into the diocese of Liége, which was afterward published. The second pupil in the course gathered the materials for a monograph upon Hugh, natural son of Lothair II, but the work was never put into writing.

In 1876–77 the class consisted of seven students. The year was spent upon the sources of history of the Barbarians.

---

[1] *Notice sur la plus ancienne biographie de St. Remacle.* (Report of the royal historical commission, 4th series, Vol. III.)

[2] *Étude critique sur St. Lambert et son premier biographe.* (Report of the Archæological Academy of Anvers, 1876.)

[3] *St. Gregorie de Tours et les études classiques au VI^e siècle.* (*Revue des questions historiques de Paris*, October, 1878).

[4] *Deux biographies inédites de St. Servais.* (Report of the society of art and history of the diocese of Liége, I, 1881.)

[5] *Les origines de la ville de Liége.* (*Ibid.*, Vol. II, 1882.)

[6] *Revue de l'instr.* (1876 and 1877, Vol. XIX, pp. 396–406: Vol. XV, pp. 20–26 and 116–124).

[7] *Memoires in 8o de l'Académie royale de Belgique*, 1882, Vol. XXXIII, 72 pp., with fac-simile.

They analyzed together, critically, the chapters I to XXVII and XXVIII to XLVI of the *Germania* of Tacitus; Jornandès on the Goths and Jornandès and Ammien Marcellin on the Huns; Priscus upon the Camp of Attila; passages from Gregory of Tours upon the Franks before Clovis and the period of Clovis and his sons; extracts from Paul Diacre upon the Lombards; Bede upon the Anglo-Saxons, Saxo Grammaticus upon the Scandinavians, besides parts of the *Lex Salica* and other Barbarian laws, and the life of St. Martin by Sulpicius Severus.

In 1877–78 the advanced section consisted of six students.[1] M. Kurth first gave a series of lectures upon hagiographical literature as a whole, and upon that of the seventh century in Gaul more specially; upon the general character of these hagiographical documents, their historical and literary value, and upon hagiographical usage. The class then went on to the *Vita Lamberti*, which was the subject of the course. This manuscript they studied in common and most thoroughly. The professor opened each lecture with remarks, bibliographical, critical and historical, upon the part of the text which one student had prepared, and then the latter explained it under the direction of M. Kurth. Besides this work, the following subjects were treated by the students in written papers: The historical value of *Vita Theodardi* and the date of its composition; The history of the foundation of Stavelot and Malmédy according to maps of the seventh century and *Vita Remacli*; The meaning of the word *Francia* from the eighth century to the tenth, studied from historical geography; Criticism of M. Bonnell's

[1] The preparatory section (five members) was particularly good this year. Their analyses were of *De moribus Germanorum* of Tacitus, *De rebus Geticis* of Jornandés, Cæsar compared with Tacitus respecting the Germans, *Historia ecclesiastica Francorum*, by Gregory of Tours; *Vita Karoli Magni*, by Eginhard. Besides this, the students studied in turn the following subjects: Gregory of Tours, the letters of Avitus and Aimoin (their respective values as sources of history of Clovis), Eginhard and the monk of St. Gall (as sources of history of Charlemagne), sources of the legend of St. Ampoule (transformation and successive additions since Gregory of Tours).

new theory of the Condrusian and Ardenian origin of the Carolingians. These essays were weak, except one which was good but incomplete.

The years 1878–80 were devoted to the study of the hagiography of Liége in the seventh and eighth centuries. A critical analysis was made of the principal lives of saints of the province of Liége. (The four lives St. Lambert, the lives of St. Théodard, St. Hubert, St. Servais and St. Remacle with the *Miracula.*) Then they studied cursorily the chronicles of Hériger and Anselm, paying special attention to those relating to Notger. They worked upon a manuscript of Hériger belonging to the abbey of Averbode. This was a preliminary study for the deeper and more special work done upon Hériger and Anselm and Gilles d'Orval in the years 1880–83. There were a half-dozen students.

In 1880–81 Prof. Kurth began with an introduction upon the historiography of the province of Liége, especially before the tenth century. He closed this preliminary course with a literary and historical study of Hériger. Then followed an analysis of the whole chronicle of Hériger, determination of the sources from which he drew and comparison of them with the chronicle itself. The principal subjects taken up in this connection were: The *Vitæ* of the saints Euchaire, Valeria and Materna, and the parts of them used by Hériger; critical study of the value of the list of bishops of Tongres before St. Servais, given by Hériger; examination of the documents relating to the biography of St. Servias which the chronicler used; critical study of the life of St. Amand de Baudemund and other documents relating to this saint; critical examination of the oral traditions accepted by Hériger upon the life of St. Jean l'Agneau; critical study of the life of St. Remacle and its various corrections.

In 1881–82, the work was upon Anselm, the successor of Hériger, and the later interpolations of Gilles d'Orval. To this course belonged M. Henri Pirenne's memoir of *Sedulius de Liége.* Another pupil studied the life and works of Bishop

Rathère. Others were engaged in making critical study of the documents relating to the life of Notger, of St. Ébrégise. The plan followed was analogous to that adopted the year before with Hériger. The professor studied with the students the original manuscript of Gilles d'Orval, preserved at the Library of the Seminary of Luxembourg, and the manuscript of Hériger and Anselm, kept at the abbey of Averbode.[1]

In 1882–83, the class studied together the original part of the chronicle of Gilles d'Orval, that is, the third book, from the point of view of the prince-bishops of Liége, Théoduin, Henri de Verdun and Otbert. After an introduction by Prof. Kurth upon Gilles d'Orval and his sources, they examined his chronicle as a whole, and then made a critical reading of the parts relating to the three reigns mentioned above. With this was connected some critical study of the anonymous document relating to the history of the transference of the relics of St. James to Liége, study of the epitaphs of the bishops of Tongres, Maastricht and Liége before the twelfth century; of Stépélinus de St. Troud and his *Miracula Trudonis* (eleventh century); of ecclesiastical serfs at St. Troud, according to the chartulary of the abbey, published by M. Piot; finally, of the origin of communal life in the country of Liége.

Four students were appointed to write monographs upon these different questions. They will be examined in the course of next year (1884). M. Kurth is thus going to give his students work in practical paleography upon manuscripts in the library at Liége and he will apply himself to determining their principal diplomatic objects. Thus the great Passionary of St.

---

[1] M. Henri Pirenne is now preparing an edition of this last MS. under the direction of Prof. Kurth.

M. Henri Pirenne, now professor at Ghent, has since 1886 conducted a practical course in national history of the Middle Ages. One of his pupils, M. Huygens, has, under his direction, just published a study upon the historical value of the chronicle of Gislebert de Mons. (*Revue de l'instr.*, 1889.)

Troud (fourteenth century) and several other manuscripts have been the subjects of united study.[1]

This double practical course of Prof. Kurth's is, without question, the most complete of those thus far attempted in Belgium. It has been at work nine years already without interruption. I will not add any eulogy; it would be quite superfluous.

III.

Practical Course of M. Vanderkindere at the Free University of Brussels (1877–1879).

In 1877–78 Prof. Vanderkindere, the well-known author of the fine book upon *Le Siècle des Artevelde*, organized a practical course in history at the Free University of Brussels and carried it on for two years. Students were admitted only after having taken Prof. Vanderkindere's course in national history. At first a dozen students undertook the work; six remained faithful to the end. An hour and a half each week was required. The subject of the course was study of communal charters of Flanders and Brabant from the twelfth to the fourteenth century inclusive, examined with a view to public institutions. The professor took up especially the comparison of charters of the same commune, so as to disentangle from them the history of the development of Flemish and Brabantine institutions.

Since 1879, to the regret of all friends of historical studies, Prof. Vanderkindere has found it impossible to continue his practical course.

---

[1] Since 1883 Prof. Kurth has continued his practical course and in 1888 published the first number of *Dissertations académiques*, written by his students (Liége, Demarteau), and containing: I. *The author of the lives of Saints Amato, Romarie, Adelphe and Arnulf*, by Émile Dony; II. *Biographical Study of Eginhard*, by Eugène Bacha.

At Liége my successor and former pupil, Prof. Eugène Hubert, in 1884 opened a practical course in national history (18th century, Maria Theresa and Joseph II).

IV.

Practical Course of M. Philippson at the Free University of Brussels (1879–1883).

A colleague of Prof. Vanderkindere, M. Philippson, formerly a professor at the University of Bonn, has happily taken up the interrupted work. At first, during the winter semester 1876–80, he devoted the course to paleography. Of the forty who began the course fifteen completed it, ten of them being students and five amateurs. After an introduction upon the history of writing in general and Latin paleography in particular, M. Philippson traced the variations of the alphabet up to the fifteenth century, by means of practical work upon the *Schrifttafeln* of Prof. Arndt of Leipzig and manuscripts in the Royal Library at Brussels. He sometimes took his students to the library to examine Latin manuscripts, teaching them to determine the date and nationality upon brief inspection.

During two semesters of 1880–81 M. Philippson repeated his course in paleography, developing the theoretical part and extending the practical exercise. The course then began with about twenty members and ended with nine, all but one of whom were students.

In 1881–82 M. Philippson directed a practical course in history, with a view to the complete seminary of history which the Free University of Brussels purposed eventually to create.[1] During the winter semester he laid down, as an introduction, the general principles of historical criticism. Then the course was directed to the comparison of the principal

[1] See M. Philippson's article, *Une nouvelle institution à l'Université de Bruxelles* in the *Jeune Revue* (1881), the organ of the Brussels students. The review has since been replaced by the *Jeune Belgique*, which (December 15, 1881) contains a short notice by a pupil of M. Philippson's practical course. It shows lively appreciation of the learned professor's efforts in giving his pupils "the guiding thread through the vast labyrinth of history."

historians of the first year of the French Revolution of 1789—Mignet, Thiers, Michelet, Quinet, Sybel, Carlyle, Ranke and Taine. The first object was to discover the spirit of each author, grasp the principles and ideas which guided him and define his characteristics and defects. This done, they proceeded to study more closely certain important events of 1789, especially those of the 5th and 6th of October at Versailles, and the origin of the war of 1792. They met for two hours each week. About fifty became members at the outset; forty continued through the first theoretical lectures by the professor. In course of the practical exercises the number gradually diminished to nine, who remained faithful to the end, and did serious work from the first day to the last. Each of the nine wrote a critical study upon the events at Versailles (5th and 6th October). Most of the essays were, of course, mediocre or bad; but there had been good work done; two were remarkable. One of the essays, written by the eldest student in the course, was distinguished by great perspicuity, and had, as M. Philippson assures me, so much value that it would not have disgraced a good historical review. With one exception the nine faithful students were comparatively mature; they had passed their examinations in philosophy, and some were even studying for the second doctorate in law.

During the summer semester of 1881–82, the practical course had eight members, who completed it. The time was devoted to the study of some disputed questions attached to the history of the first crusade. They first attempted to judge between Tudebod and the anonymous author of *Gesta Francorum*, as to which was the imitator of the other. Then they examined Albert d'Aix to determine what degree of credence can be accorded him. Their conclusion was that, in regard to the first crusade, Albert usually limited himself to relating popular traditions; in this connection they distinguished the different current traditions which are to be found in his chronicle.

The professor sought to secure, as far as possible, the direct intervention and initiative of the students. At the end of the semester they chose, with M. Philippson, subjects for written work to be done during the long vacation.

At the beginning of the next semester (1882–83), M. Philippson received two remarkable monographs upon the election of Pope Clement V. The excellence of one of them was particularly striking.[1] At the same time he received three or four others, a great deal weaker—some upon the campaign of Frederic Barbarossa in Lombardy (1176), others upon Ravaillac's confederates. These papers were first examined and criticised by a fellow-student appointed to the work, then by the professor, who permitted absolute freedom of discussion.

For the winter semester of 1882–83, the subjects of the course were Sully's *Memoires*, and the question of the famous "*grand dessin*" of Henry IV. The summer semester was devoted to the study of the actual causes and circumstances of the murder of Darnley. They worked from the sources.

At the end of each semester, M. Philippson required each student to develop, in his turn, his view of the subject treated, thus obliging them to give continual attention to the work, to take notes and, above all, to think for themselves. He took every occasion to recall and apply the principles of criticism which he had briefly laid down in the beginning.[2]

---

[1] M. Philippson informs me that he intends to publish the better of these two works, as soon as he shall have collected others of equal strength, written by his students.

[2] Prof. Vanderkindere and Prof. Philippson have continued their practical courses since 1883. They have just published the first number of the works of their students under the title, *Free University of Brussels. Record of the Faculty of Philosophy and Arts.* It contains: I, *The Election of Pope Clement V*, by M. Léon Leclercq; II, *Critical Essay upon the Chronicle of Albert d'Aix*, by M. Francois Vercruysse; III, The "Wergeld" of the free Romans in the dominion of the Ripuarians, by M. Louis Wodon. I and II come from Prof. Philippson's practical course; III, from Prof. Vanderkindere's.

This practical teaching of M. Philippson's, first in paleography and afterward in mediæval and modern history, holds a distinguished place among the rare attempts of the kind in our universities. A historian, whose books carry great authority, and formerly a professor in one of the best Prussian universities, M. Philippson has deserved well of Belgium for initiating the students of Brussels into the scientific methods honored by the scholars of Germany.

V.

Practical Course of Prof. Fredericq at the State University of Liége (1880–83).[1]

I may be permitted to mention here, in chronological order, the practical course in history which I have directed at the University of Liége since the academic year 1880–81.

Fourteen pupils at first presented themselves, of whom six belonged to the course in philosophy, five to the normal school and three to the law school. About half went through the year. The subject of the course was the Inquisition in the Netherlands in the 16th century. I first devoted a few lec-

---

[1] In 1884 I was transferred to Ghent. Since then I have opened a practical course upon the sources of history of the Inquisition in the Netherlands. The *Corpus Inquisitionis Neerlandicae* (1880) is the first fruit of the course; it is the collective work of professor and pupils.

The published works of my practical course at Liége are as follows: First number (1883); I, *The study of history in Belgium* (the present work) by Paul Frédéricq; II, *The birth and maternal ancestry of Margaret of Austria*, by G. Crutzen; III, *The edicts of the prince-bishops of Liége in regard to heresy*, by H. Lonchay; IV, *The teaching of the Calvinists at Ghent*, by P. Frédéricq; V, *The treaty of 1339 between Flanders and Ghent, renewed in 1578*, by P. Frédéricq.

Second number (1884); I, *The policy of Gérard de Groesbeek*, by Henri Pirenne; II, *Fray Lorence*, by A. Journeg; III, *The Inquisition in the Netherlands in the 16th century*, by E. Monseur; IV, by E. Hubert.

tures to a theoretical introduction, treating of the object of practical courses, the ideas and legislation of the sixteenth century in the matter of heresy, and the principal sources (bulls and edicts, documents of the records, pamphlets of the time, memoirs and chronicles of contemporaries, more recent historians).

Certain students then presented analyses of the principal works of Gachard and Henne and other contemporary specialists relative to the Netherlandic Inquisition. Then we passed on to critical and detailed study of the text of the bulls *Exsurge, Domine* (1520) and *Decet Romanum pontificem* (1521) of Pope Leo X, of the imperial edict of Charles V given at Worms the same year, and the broadsides published against the Protestants of the Netherlands by Charles V in 1526, 1529 and 1531. We studied likewise the part played by lay judges and inquisitors according to the papal bulls of 1542 and 1551, the famous *Instructio pro inquisitoribus haereticae pravitatis* of Charles V (1550) and the curious documents in the archives of Mons published by M. A. Loin (*Bulletins de la commission royale d'histoire*, 2nd series, vol. VIII). Each document was prepared in advance by a pupil, who analyzed it and sometimes read it through, commenting upon it as he read; the others in their turn discussed it under my direction.

Besides this, two pupils were charged to study special questions and report to the class the result of their investigations. One of them in this manner presented an approximate chronological list of the Inquisitors of the sixteenth century in the Netherlands, according to printed documents and the works of Gachard, Henne, etc.[1] The second briefly sketched the history of the Inquisitions of the sixteenth century in Liége, according to the edicts of prince-bishops, published by Raikem and Polain, and according to the works of Fred.

[1] This essay, revised and developed, will appear in our second number. The author is M. Eug. Monseur, then a student in the Faculty of Philosophy.

Hénaux, Rahlenbeck and Lenoir.[1] We had twenty-five meetings of an hour each.

In 1881–82 the class numbered seven, two from the doctorate in philosophy, three from the history section of the Normal School, one from the law school and one from the first doctorate in law. All but one had taken the course the preceding year and all continued to the end. The first ten lessons were spent in studying the birth and maternal descent of Margaret of Parma, regent of the Netherlands, from the sources and the works of Serrure, Vander Meersch, Vander Taelen, Reumont and Rawdon Brown, besides the remarkable prefaces to the three volumes of Correspondence of Margaret of Parma, published by M. Gachard. One student was charged to state all the elements of the problem in a paper which was read by him to the class and discussed in common.[2]

The last fourteen meetings were spent upon the history of the repression of heresy in the Netherlands in the sixteenth century. After several students had presented abstracts of certain chapters from Alex. Henne's excellent book, *Histoire du regne de Charles-Quint dans les Pays-Bas*, and of the numerous documents there cited, we went on to the reading and detailed critical analysis of the edicts of Charles V, promulgated in 1550, *Instructio pro inquisitoribus haereticae pravitatis* (already cursorily examined the year before), and of a bull of Pope Julius II (1550). Then we studied in detail the text of the Pacification of Ghent and, less thoroughly, the contents of

---

[1] The author of this study, M. Henri Lonchay, then a student in the history section at the Normal School, took from it material for a popular article in the *Revue de Belgique* (August 1881) entitled The Inquisition in the Province of Liége. The present number contains an essay by M. Lonchay, revised and extended according to his work in the practical course of 1880–81.

[2] This work appeared in the *Revue de l'instr.* (1882, Vol. XXV, pp. 153–170). The author, M. Guillaume Crutzen, then a student in the history section of the Normal School, has since rewritten the article and it is published in my present series of monographs.

the other great treaties relative to our religious wars (The Agreement of Brussels, Perpetual Edict of Don Juan, Religious Peace of Anvers, Agreements of Utrecht and Arras). This was a sort of introduction and preparation for the work of the following year.

In 1882–83 the course dealt with the preliminaries and the negotiation of the Pacification of Ghent. Six students, one from the course in philosophy, three from the doctorate, two from the Normal School and one from the first doctorate in law, took the course and worked faithfully. Three of them had taken the work of the two preceding years; one, of the year preceding; two took it for the first time. The meetings were lengthened from an hour to an hour and a half or two hours and we met twenty-five times.

I began with an introduction upon the sources and the disputed questions of the Pacification of Ghent. Then we studied together the Correspondence of Philip II, published by Gachard (part of the documents of the year 1576), the letters of the same epoch in Gachard's Correspondence of William the Silent and van Prinsterer's Records of the House of Orange-Nassau, as well as the principal memoirs and chronicles of the time, with a view to the preliminaries and negotiation of the Pacification. These memoirs of the sixteenth century were made the subject of a series of written essays; the essay of each student was submitted to another student who annotated it; then I examined them and wrote out my observations. The essays, thus twice corrected, were then read and discussed in the meeting. They bore chiefly upon the Acts of State in September, 1576; negotiations between the Netherlands and Liége at the same period; Anonymous Memoirs, published by M. Blaes; Memoirs of Del Rio, published by Abbé Delvigne; Commentaries of Bernadino of Mendoza, published by M. Guillaume; *Notules* of Berty, published by Gachard; Reports of the Venetian Ambassadors (1576); Discourse upon the Government of Council of State, by the councillor d'Assonleville, published by Gachard, and Memoir of Bishop Metsin,

published by Gachard. These essays were quite extensive and very carefully written; they clearly indicated the position which can be taken from each of these sources for the history of the Pacification of Ghent. The opinions of Motley, van Vloten and Nuyens were also analyzed and discussed in writing.

For my share I gave an account of what was useful to us in *Resolutien van Holland*, the *Dagboek* of Jan de Pottere, the *Diarium* of Philippe van Campene and the work of Michel ab Isselt, *Sui temporis Historia*. I reserved to myself also researches in the records and communicated the results to my pupils, going to Holland to study some documents in the archives of The Hague, Utrecht and Middelbourg, and some rare printed documents in the library at The Hague. I submitted to them also my extracts from certain registers in the royal archives at Brussels, in the communal archives at Ghent, besides letters and information sent me by Prof. Fruin at Leyden and the archivists Van den Bergh of The Hague, Gachard[1] of Brussels, Devillers[2] of Mons, Diegerick[3] of Ypres, Hoop of Ghent, Gilliodts van Severen and Vanden Busche of Bruges. I here heartily thank these eminent specialists for their aid.

The last two meetings were devoted to the reading of my essay upon the public teaching of the Calvinists of Ghent (1578–1584).

After two years of preliminary study I have thus been able to start, with pupils reasonably well prepared, upon a quite special study which will end next year in the publication of a collective treatise, of considerable extent, upon the Pacification of Ghent.

---

[1] M. Gachard, archivist-general, kindly allowed me to have for a month, at the State Archives of Liége, a valuable register from his department.

[2] M. Devillers sent me some very detailed analysis of certain documents in the archives of Mons.

[3] M. Diegerick sent us a series of his publications relating to the 16th century.

Since 1880–81 the students have been required, each in turn, to keep minutes of the progress of our debates and of the results arrived at, which the reporter read at the following meeting; these minutes were approved after correction and copied into a register *ad hoc*, where a close history of the three years' practical course is thus recorded. In 1881, at the time of my visit to the University of Halle, M. Conrad, the eminent professor of political economy, told me that he had long used this method in his practical course and that he had found it of great value. I am entirely of his opinion as to the utility of the minutes of our meetings.

I trust I shall be pardoned for dwelling thus long upon my own course; it is the portion upon which it is easiest for me to give complete information, and perhaps I shall be excused for the paternal tenderness with which I have spoken.

VI.

Practical Course of Prof. Thomas at the State University at Ghent (1882–1883).

During the closing academic year, two practical courses in history have been undertaken at the University of Ghent, under Prof. Thomas for the first semester, and under Prof. Motte for the second. The course directed by Prof. Paul Thomas was devoted to ancient history; it consisted of one lecture of an hour, each week until Easter. At the first lecture twenty-seven students were present; a dozen went on to the end. All were students of the course in philosophy except one, who was studying for the doctorate.

The work was upon the sources for the Conspiracy of Catiline. M. Thomas began with an introduction upon the principles of historical criticism. He then briefly stated the condition of the Roman Republic at the time of the conspiracy; then he enumerated all the sources, characterizing them. After this introduction the class passed on to practical work upon

the Catiline of Sallust compared with the Catilinian Orations of Cicero.

The students were required to write a series of short essays upon the following subjects:

1. Analyze the Catiline of Sallust, separate the principal narrative from digressions and arrange the facts as nearly as possible in chronological order wherever Sallust has failed to do so; point out the principal phases of the conspiracy; examine the circumstances of time and place in which the four orations against Catiline were delivered, and show what place they should occupy in Sallust's narrative.

These points were written upon by thirteen students. Their work was generally mediocre.

2. Compare the first Catilinian Oration with Sallust; note differences and resemblances and what details are found in Cicero that are not found in Sallust.

Only one essay had been written upon this subject and that by the student for the doctorate. He had worked carefully and showed insight and critical power.

3. Write a summary of the second Oration and determine its character; compare it with the first; compare it with Sallust.

Each of these points was to be treated separately. The essays handed in were weak.

4. Compare the third Oration with Sallust.

One student only attempted this work and his essay was weak.

5. Review the fourth Oration and compare it with Sallust.

The student to whom this was assigned (one from the course in philosophy) did good work, remarkable for depth as well as form.

All the essays were discussed and criticised before the class. M. Thomas pointed out defects and errors, put questions to the listeners and attempted to make them draw conclusions for themselves. The great difficulty of the course was the insufficient knowledge of Latin on the part of most of the students. Work in ancient history is hard to organize in

Belgium on this account. I hope, however, that my excellent friend, M. Thomas, will not be disheartened, but will courageously continue what he has so well begun this year.[1]

VII.

Practical Course of Prof. Motte at the State University of Ghent (1882–1883).

On account of painful circumstances, Prof. Motte has been able to begin his course but late, and to give to it only ten meetings. About twenty students have attended it, all students in the department of philosophy except one, who was in the doctorate. The subject was the malice-aforethought of the massacre of St. Bartholomew. As it was late in the year, and examinations were approaching, the professor could not think of requiring personal work from the students. The course was, therefore, purely theoretical.

Professor Motte began by stating the terms of the ever-debated question as to the premeditation of the event and the responsibility of the principal actors. He then developed the fundamental principles of historical criticism and applied them to the subject in question, taking a necessary glance at the Reformation in France, the position of the parties, the court, the Huguenots, etc. Then he passed in rapid review the general sources of history for the West in the sixteenth century, and stopped longer at the special contemporary sources for the St. Bartholomew's Day, and the principal later writers, German, English, Belgian, Dutch, Spanish, Italian. He closed with a statement of all the disputed questions connected with the subject.

---

[1] Prof. Thomas has left the teaching of history in order to devote himself to ancient philology. His practical course has, however, been taken up by Prof. de Ceuleneer (1889).

These lectures were a sort of introduction to the practical work which the professor intends to begin at the commencement of the next academic year.[1]

Such is, in brief, the work that has been done thus far toward introducing into Belgian Faculties of Arts and Philosophy practical exercise in history. We may conclude that, whenever such a course has been attempted, it has been zealously taken up by the students and the professor has been amply repaid for his trouble. This answers the only important objection that can be made to the organization of practical courses in history by the faculties. The opinion of a stranger, a German professor who has been teaching at the University of Brussels since 1879, is as follows:

"Objections are made," says M. Philippson, "on the ground of the spirit of materialism and utilitarianism of the Belgian youth. But has not everything been done to develop the tendency to this spirit in our young university men? Have they ever been told that study exists for anything but practical ends? Moreover, I am convinced that we are mistaken in the young men in this regard. Because of the vividness of my recollections of another country (Germany), I feel justified in making a comparison and in concluding that among the students at Brussels there are many who, in their zeal, diligence, love of science, ardent and generous aspirations, are in no sense behind the best in German universities."[2]

It may be that M. Philippson thinks too highly of the Belgian youth; but it seems to me indisputable that the practical courses, though appealing only to the elect, will always find a sufficient and ardent support.

In brief, the results thus far obtained are very modest. Aside from the history section at the Normal School, Liége

---

[1] Prof. Motte has continued his practical course, taking up Mary Stuart besides studying further upon St. Bartholomew's Day (1889).

[2] Article cited above from the *Jeune Revue*.

has two optional practical courses, M. Kurth's and my own; Brussels has but one, M. Philippson's; Ghent will have two, those of M. Thomas and M. Motte; Louvain has none as yet.[1] But it can be said that the experiment has been tried and that, by the teachings of experience, the inexcusable defect in our university organization has been clearly pointed out to the government. I have therefore great confidence that the day is not far distant when the minister of public instruction, inspired by the example of foreign universities, will transform into official practical courses our humble ones now left to the gropings of certain volunteer professors and students.[2] In no other way can the

---

[1] Although the Catholic University of Louvain has no practical course in history it may well be proud of its *Societas Philologa* which Prof. P. Willems has directed for twelve years with admirable tact and devotion. This Philological Society, meeting at the professor's house, serves to make up the deficiency in the Belgian doctorate in philosophy in respect to classical philology, which in its true sense embraces the language, history, institutions and fine arts of Greece and Rome. The principal object is the examination of the most important articles in Belgian and foreign philological reviews. According to the regulations each member, in his turn, reads and reports upon certain articles. Thus all are, to a certain extent, kept abreast of the general movement of the science. Besides this, they study each year one Greek or Latin author most thoroughly. Two young colleagues of Prof. Willems, Professors Brants and Colard, take part and aid by important information.

The society has already contributed to the production of distinguished scholars, among whom are my colleagues at Liége, M. Charles Michael, and Brants and Colard. For further details I refer to the annual reports of the society. Prof. Willems's books have a well-deserved European reputation; but, in my opinion, his *Societas Philologa* is his finest and most fruitful work.

In 1885 Prof. Moeller opened a practical course in history at Louvain, so that all four of the Belgian universities now possess them. At Ghent there are four (by Pirenne, Motte, de Ceuleneer and Frédéricq); at Liége two (by Kurth and Hubert); at Brussels two (by Vanderkindere and Philippson); at Louvain one (by Moeller). This makes a total of nine practical courses. It seems to me indisputable that outside of Germany and France the new historical methods have made most progress in Belgium (1889).

[2] The government ought to recognize the practical courses, by giving the professor an assistant and a small annual allowance for the purchase of

higher teaching of history be efficiently organized in Belgium; for theoretical courses, however excellent, have never made a historian.

I have quoted (in preceding foot-notes) a remarkable article published in the *Revue de Belgique* (May 15th, 1880,) by my eminent colleague and friend, M. Vanderkindere, under the title Teaching of History and the Creation of a Higher Institute of History. After stating all the deficiencies and absurdities of the actual organization and paying due tribute to the exercises in paleography conducted by M. Philippson at Brussels, he recommended the creation of a higher institute of history at Brussels. It seems to me evident that the government should reorganize the Faculties of the two universities before going to great expense to found a new institution in the capital.

In 1881 M. Vanderkindere, developing his plan in a discourse delivered to the House, proposed the creation, at Brussels, of a complete institution of higher branches, including all the sciences. It is obvious that such an institution would doom the Faculties. It would simply furnish the Free University of Brussels with a series of scientific courses without burdening the budget of that private establishment.

Although the intervention of the government may be more or less near, it seems to me that the professors of history in our universities ought for the present to add an optional practical course to their theorectical courses. No law or regulation prevents them. Let us begin by setting the example and support will come.

Let us, first of all, produce students.

In the Faculties of medicine and sciences where numerous practical courses have existed for years, as in Germany where

---

necessary books, just as it has already done for the departments of science and medicine. In other respects the professor should be sole judge of what is to be done in the course. He alone is competent in the matter; the liberty allowed him in the German universities is necessary if the whole benefit of practical courses is to be reaped.

teaching has always had a strong practical tendency, Belgian professors have students in the true sense of the word. We have in our course in history only passive listeners. They can no more be called the pupils of a great professor because they have attended that professor's course than they could be called pupils of Rubenstein or Liszt after having heard these masters in concerts.

We confine ourselves a little too much to giving concerts to the students of our Faculty. The music we make for them is not always very scholarly, since, thanks to our detestable law upon higher teaching, most of our courses are only elementary resumés; so much so that it sometimes happens that printed manuals, which everybody can find in a library, are worth more than the lecture courses so laboriously given. Of course this is the exception. We have in our Faculty of Philosophy scholars who are justly renowned; but we forget to show to our more or less admiring listeners the mechanism of the instrument upon which we play. Thus the science of history appears to them an inaccessible thing, beautiful in itself but only to be viewed from afar by them, a mysterious matter which professional secrecy forbids us to reveal to them.[1]

---

[1] In an excellent study upon the University of Berlin M. Emile Banning insists upon the sterility of the higher teaching of history in Belgium: "At the close of their academic studies most of the young men possess only vague ideas in matters of history, a little knowledge without foundation. This fact is especially to be regretted, since, in a country where the philosophical sciences are little cultivated, the majority of minds require from the serious study of history only broad and rational principles, strong and deep convictions, to guide them in their conduct as free citizens. But the fault of which I speak is still more serious for those who propose to develop what they have acquired at the university and to devote themselves to original research. They must often meet, at the beginning of their career, almost insurmountable obstacles, which, added to material difficulties, frequently discourage good minds. It is really only after the loss of much time in fruitless, groping attempts, that they at last learn to find their way among the innumerable documents of every sort and every degree of value which we have inherited." (Report on the organization and teaching of the University of Berlin, pp. 66 and 67, 1861.) This report contains much that

We write and talk incessantly about reform in higher teaching and we do not refrain from addressing to the government objurgations more or less insistent. It is only right. But are we not ourselves somewhat at fault? After all, the government, in its incompetent simplicity, does not know just what there is to do and hesitates to undertake problems whose conditions and method of solution are obscure to them; while *we* know perfectly well that it is not such and such a chair of history that is wanted, such a detail of organization, such a building or such a regulation; but that it is a *scientific spirit in the students* which is lacking, and that this spirit can be roused only by means of practical courses. Let us then go to our students, draw them into our work-rooms, direct their reading, teach them the scientific method by personal exercise in all historical matters which have till now been sterile theory to them. Let us prove the value of the method by using it; when we shall have done that it will be necessary for the government to join with us.

There is one point which remains to be examined and upon which the success of the practical courses greatly depends. Let us suppose them flourishing at all our universities. Each one would annually furnish a certain number of apprentice historians, acquainted with the use of historical instruments and capable of devoting themselves to personal research. But what would they do upon leaving the university? They would be too young and inexperienced to aspire to a professor's chair; a few of them would be attracted to intermediate teaching; others would become lawyers, functionaries, etc.,

---

would be of use to all who work in history here; especially do his remarks upon the teaching of history in Prussian Gymnasiums, in the different historical schools of the time show a remarkable appreciation of Ranke and his works, details of Prof. Droysen's and other of the more important courses in Berlin at the time.

and would find themselves obliged to neglect or more often abandon the historical pursuits toward which they were drawn and for which they already possessed valuable preparation. There would be only a small minority who could pursue the study by the aid of a sufficient personal fortune or some other equally rare circumstance. Much pains and effort would thus be lost, bringing no profit to the progress of historical sciences in Belgium.

It becomes necessary then to find a means of making the practical courses bear their fruits.

It is first to be desired that funds[1] be established to permit the best students to go abroad and take the courses of the princes of the science in Germany and Paris. Of course no young man of small fortune would be willing to undertake this noble dilettantism without the prospect of later finding a career. It would thus be highly necessary to introduce into our universities the *privat-docent* system of Germany.[2]

With us each chair constitutes a sort of life-monopoly for the professor. Aside from exceptional and extremely rare cases all scientific rivalry is impossible.[3] Hence it happens

---

[1] The government ought considerably to increase the number of foreign scholarships at these universities.

[2] This reform has been many times recommended in Belgium. Prof. Loomans and Prof. De Laveleye ten years ago formally proposed it to the council for the perfecting of higher teaching, which accepted it unanimously, I believe. Further, M. Loomans has been one of the first, if not the first in Belgium to demand the introduction of the system, notably in his remarkable report to the Minister of the Interior in 1845: *Rapport sur l'enseignement supérieur en Prusse.* M. Banning's report, already mentioned, is not less remarkable.

[3] In the same report M. Banning says: "We have in our universities a good number of men of great and rare merit, scholars of the first order, choice minds which even the institutions of Germany might envy us. But it is undeniable that the scientific spirit is weak among us, notwithstanding the brilliancy and zeal of our professors and our happy situation at the centre of the great network of communication of all modern ideas and aspirations. To what shall we attribute this deplorable state of things if not to the vices of our university organization? The system destroys per-

that when a Belgian professor is incapable, the subject which he teaches remains in neglect for an average of twenty years and one sees generations of students follow one another to his feet, discouraged, enervated, obliged not only to attend an insufficient course but to learn it by heart for examination. In Germany on the contrary, every doctor may present himself to the Faculty, from which he has his diploma, to submit to a severe scientific examination which qualifies him—that is allows him to teach in that Faculty. Without this qualification he will not be admitted to rivalry with titular professors. This is true scientific liberty, and experience has proved that it alone can preserve a noble emulation in the teaching body and weaken the effects of improper nominations, by providing a nursery of young scholars, ready to fill the vacancies which death or superannuation causes each year in the staff of the Faculty.

But it is not everything to have the privilege of adopting the career of higher teaching; it is also necessary to keep from dying of starvation in devoting one's self to science. In Germany the position of *privat-docenten* and professors extraordinary is far from enviable. The regular professors alone are comfortably paid by the State. Sometimes the professors extraordinary receive no salary at all; even when they do receive one, their class-fees constitute their principal revenue. *Privat-docenten* have only the small fees of their occasional pupils. In regard to this M. Seignobos,[1] professor of the

---

sonal initiative and does not know how itself to produce life. So long as liberty is rendered impossible by a prescribed outline, so long as the teaching of each important branch is left to one professor, however great his genius, we shall never see the existence of that scientific life which springs from the encounter of rival ideas and from the strife of opposed conceptions and diverging methods. This Germany perfectly understands." Before this, in 1845, M. Loomans had said: "To tell the truth, our system rests upon the isolation and privilege of the professors; the German system, upon their union and rivalry."

[1] *Revue internationale de l'enseignement*, June 15th, 1881, p. 569.

Faculty of Arts at Dijon, who has carefully studied the organization of higher teaching in Germany, says: "The scholar without private fortune is obliged to make his living by work in libraries, by popular lectures, by contributions to reviews, by becoming secretary to some scientific enterprise. It is truly a career of adventure. Nevertheless there does not a year pass without the qualification of many young men for history; there is not a Faculty which has not at least one *privat-docent* in history, and most of them have four or five. Is it not an unquestionable proof of the love of the Germans for the historical sciences that a profession which supports its men so ill should be so much sought?"

We cannot for a moment think of improving our universities with the hope of raising in Belgium a generation of young scholars who are to live in misery for years, after the example of the brave and starving *privat-docenten* of Germany. The government must make an endurable lot for those upon whom it wishes to be able to depend. There is no doubt of it. It ought, I think, to guarantee a temporary salary of 2,000 to 4,000 francs to those who shall have obtained the qualification of a Belgian Faculty. It seems to me to be the only equitable means of attaching them to the university.

At the end of a few years the government would reap a hundred fold that which it has sowed. We should see the higher teaching of history[1] rise to a level before unknown. New courses would be added and would attract the best of students. Paleography, epigraphy, diplomacy, criticism of sources would cease to be *terra incognita*. Practical courses would be multiplied. The young blood infused into our Faculties would reanimate the now drowsy organism; in a word, scientific life would become infinitely more intense. The *privat-docenten* would form the nursery of future titular professors; the government would have no more embarrass-

[1] What is here said of history is equally true of the other sciences taught in our Faculty of Philosophy and Arts.

ment in choosing an occupant for a vacant chair, and the chair would always be in possession of a scholar who had already written and taught, a condition almost never found at present.[1]

Our minister of public instruction, M. Van Humbeeck, seems, moreover, willing to accept this view. A royal decision of January 21st, 1883, complemented by ministerial decisions of June 13th following, institutes *assistants* and *special fellows* in the Faculties of science and medicine. "The special duty of these assistants will be to aid the professor in experimental and practical teaching as well as in laboratory work. They will be chosen from the doctors of three or more years standing or from those who, having been longer in the profession, have written scientific works. The number of assistants is fixed by the government according to the needs of the department, so that at least one assistant may, if possible, be attached to each course which includes practical work." The minister nominates the assistants upon the recommendation of the professor interested and the advice of the Faculty, rector and administrator-inspector. The assistant receives an annual stipend of 2,000 francs which, after four years, is increased to 3,000 francs.

At the expiration of these four or six years, the assistant who, in the course of his service shall have published scientific works

---

[1] Speaking in his report of the German *privat-docenten* M. Loomans says (pp. 51 and 73): "The fellowship ought to be the nursery of professors; young men of talent should there be prepared for the career of teachers. We have a term of probation for the bar, the magistracy and the administration; much more ought we to have it for the professorate. Further, the fellowship should be a large and liberal institution, to which admission is easy, where aptitudes for science may be fully developed, where ability shall have an assured future *and lack of ability shall not.* A certain number of years in professorate under the eyes of the Faculty, in full view of every critic, would furnish opportunity for making a good choice. The governments of Germany do not make mistakes; the composition of their corps of university teachers leaves nothing to be desired. The assistant professors are naturally ranked according to their merit. The opinion of universities is an impartial one; it rules the choice of the government."

or shown particular aptitudes may, upon recommendation of the Faculty interested,[1] the rector and the administrator-inspector, be appointed *special fellow*. These special fellows may be authorized by the minister to give lectures upon new or special topics and to assist in the theoretical teaching of the professor if he desires. The Faculty may summon the special fellows to their meetings for consultation and call upon them to sit as judges at examinations. Their term of service is three years. It may always be renewed upon the recommendation of the same body of men who at first conferred the appointment. The salary is never less than 3,000 francs.

It is necessary only to extend these excellent provisions to the Faculty of Philosophy and Arts in order to see them produce the same fruits which are justly expected from the sciences and medicine. The day when this shall be done will be a day of great advance toward the scientific reorganization of our Faculty. The study of history particularly, which cannot flourish without practical courses, will respond to the treatment.

To sum up in a few words, the following seems to me the most urgent reform: the creation of thorough historical courses in the doctorate in philosophy, the creation of practical courses, the natural recruiting of the teaching body by the institution

---

[1] This preponderating influence of the Faculty interested ought to be found as well in the nomination of *professors*. Only the Faculties are competent and understand the weight of the new responsibility imposed upon them in the sight of the scientific world. A minister in Belgium is first of all a politician and he will always find in the House a majority of politicians to approve his nominations, whatever they may be. Moreover a man can be statesman of the first order without being able to distinguish the most meritorious man among the candidates for a chair of philosophy, Greek, history, Roman law, botany, chemistry, physiology, etc. It is radically impossible that any man, however wise, should be in position to make, alone and uncontrolled, the university nominations. Who would not smile if Darwin were required to appoint the professors in the Faculties of Philosophy and Arts? And how many Darwins are there among our ministers? In Germany the Faculties really dictate the minister's choice.

of assistants and special fellows who will play the part of the German *privat-docenten*.

It is a common-place that the study of history is indispensable to a free people, called upon to govern itself. Knowledge of the past alone makes the present comprehensible, and enables men to avoid the reefs upon which their ancestors have made shipwreck. In improving the teaching of history we shall render service not only to science but to our land.

Notes supplementary to the Johns Hopkins University
Studies in Historical and Political Science, 1890, No. 4.

THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECT OF THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL MUSEUM.

By Professor OTIS T. MASON,
Curator of the Department of Ethnology.

Read before the Historical Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University.

It gives me great pleasure to speak to you this evening on University instruction in the National Museum, especially that portion of it which relates to mankind. I might have called my subject, the natural history of ideas,—as illustrated in the arrangement of the Anthropological Department of the Smithsonian Institution. In every well ordered museum there are two museums, and there are two radically different opinions among the men in charge as to which of these two should rule over the other.

If you were to accompany me to the fourth story of the north tower, Smithsonian building, I would show you a distinguished conchologist, in a most attractive suite of chambers, furnished with cherry cabinets securely locked to defend against thieves and careless fingers the "study series" of museum shells. Only now and then does a citizen of the outside world set eyes upon these gorgeous treasures. They are for the curator and his brother conchologists. On the ground floor of the same building arranged in glazed cases you may see any day in common with all who have the necessary curiosity the "exhibition series" of shells. Now shall the fourth story be administered for the sake of the ground floor?

Perhaps you are not fond of shells, but take the birds into your fancy. Well, the lesson is the same. Along that balcony behind the wire screen are thousands upon thousands of bird skins which the public never see. That is the "study series." While here below perched upon neat stands, as near the mimicry of life as taxidermist's skill can come, peep through the glass doors miles of the feathered tribes. These are the "exhibition

series." And the question comes again which is servant to the other? To pass from curator to curator is but to repeat the enigma. Whether it be marine invertebrates, insects, fishes, reptiles or mammals, there are ten times more of precious specimens carefully locked in the drawers than are exposed to public gaze. All museums resemble each other in this regard.

You will occasionally hear one of the favored gentlemen say: "If I had my way there should be no 'exhibition series.' The public have no business to see these things. Every moment I spend in mounting specimens for the public to gaze at is lost from my work, and every dollar appropriated to costly mounting and plate glass is just so much diverted from procuring new and fresh material for me." I heard this very argument used by a distinguished keeper of one of the best museums of Europe.

On the other hand men equally as learned say: "What is the use of writing books for nobody to read? If you stir up a love for these things in the public, will they not fill your mill with grist, build your cases for your study series and give you money to perfect your work?" And so the battle has been fought for you while you were being born and nourished, and the public are now freely invited to share the joy of the naturalist.

In the field of natural history the students of Johns Hopkins University do not need to be told by me that human ingenuity has exhausted itself to devise ways of showing to the eye the processes of nature by means of pictures, microphotographs, dried and alcoholic specimens, casts, and models in wax, paper or plaster. The ontogeny of many species, the classification, the variations, the result of all the forces which combined constitute environment, comparative anatomy and evolution of form, are beautifully set up in our great collections, attractive as works of art and admired by all lovers of nature.

Now all this has been the growth of years. I shall not dwell upon it. Indeed I only mention the subject to introduce what I may have to say to you upon the National Museum in its relation to natural history of man and the connection of this method of study with the pursuit of human history.

To my thinking, anthropology is the application of all the methods of natural history to the study of man, of his anatomy,

his physiology, his measurements and external characters, his psycho-physical activities. But I extend my definition even to his inventions, in the arts of living, in social life, in language and opinions, giving to the word invention its widest possible application to everything that man has found out how to do since his first appearance on this planet. By this rule I would call not only useful and decorative arts inventions, but language, literatures, social fabrics, laws, customs, fashions, even creeds and cults as formulated in words or set up in modes of worship are inventions. Observe carefully that I extend my measuring, counting and dissecting even to man's inventions in the arts of living, in social life, in speech and in opinions. Only, in this case you can actually see the basket being made, the flax being spun, the vase being moulded, the iron implement being forged, and you may also see the weaver, the spinner, the potter and the smith in action. But practically to the curator and to the student of archaeology, especially, the facile hand has been removed and he can only in imagination conceive the creative purpose in the handiwork. This brings him strikingly near the naturalist in the last appeal, whether he takes theistic or non-theistic views of creation.

Inventions may also be studied in their structure and their functions, their genera and species, their evolution and their philogeny, their relation to environment, their combined share in great historic movements akin to the prevalence or scarcity of great masses of plants or animals. The clothes we wear, the houses we inhabit, the tools of our daily toil, the arts we cultivate, the words we utter, the customs we practice, our social fabric, our beliefs and conduct in presence of the spirit world, all of these may be treated as so many plants or insects, birds or mammals. In our historic, ethnic or technic studies we need omit no process in vogue among keepers of such specimens and we may follow them implicitly in every method they employ.

It is only within the memory of many now living that the methods and apparatus of the natural historian have been applied successfully to human affairs. Indeed you would be astonished in visiting some of the grandest ethnological museums of Europe to find that not one progressive step had been taken in fifty years. In them, locality, blood, nationality and language are confounded

and made the one category of arrangement. All else is the work of the upholsterer.

The use of the inventive faculty, the art of inventing, has been no exception to this rule of similarity with the organic world. The first inventors had few instrumentalities, few processes between them and the finished result, the great professional inventors like Edison and Graham Bell call into action a most complicated set of agencies and methods that can be likened only to such highly organized beings as man himself. Between the first "happy thought" and the latest protected invention there is a long series of inventive processes related and developed into higher and higher forms. The first invention may possibly have been a literal translation of the Latin *invenio*. The man found something that suited him better than the common run of objects in the same class. The series seems to have run somewhat thus.

1. Accidental discovery. Mere observation and apperception.
2. Happy thought. Utilization of natural forces.
3. Design. The patterns in weaving, etc.
4. Experiment. Trying between two or more ways and means.
5. Natural reward stimulus. Better luck, greater strength.
6. Social and civil rewards. Headman, chieftaincies, Olympian games, and the like.
7. Patents and monopolies.
8. Co-operative invention.

But I would not mislead you into thinking that our National Museum was the first to use the method of the naturalist in the study of inventions. I cannot even tell you the exact time and place of its origin, but your speaker caught the contagion, many years ago, from Dr. Gustav Klemm, of Dresden, who went all over the world collecting things to show how this splendid animal, called man, had invented his own successes. The king of Saxony did not appreciate this wonderful seer and his great collection. The city of Leipsic bought the material on the death of Dr. Klemm and you may now see it in the shabbiest of buildings on the Johannis-Platz.

A far richer cabinet and one that met a better fate is that of Col. Lane-Fox, now Gen. Pitt-Rivers, to be seen in the rear of the Natural History Museum at Oxford.

The great world expositions and the special lines of taste and research followed by men of learning and fortune have enriched almost every great city of Europe with collections arranged to show the elaboration of one or more industries. But you will allow me to throw one other flower upon the grave of Gustav Klemm, inasmuch as I pluck it from the conservatory of your historical Seminary. He was one of the very first men to recognize the mutual dependence of the historian and the ethnographer. He knew well that it is very rash for us museum people to adopt conclusions that contradict the testimony; and he also knew that interpretations could not be given to writings which are absurd in the light of things. Perhaps he would say to you at your work. Go over to Washington and hear all those anthropologists have to say, but do not altogether lose your heads and your reverence for historical records, for true methods of historic study are among the highest of all inventions.

In the study of the natural history of invention there occurs something very like the degrees of complexity in organic beings. For your unicellular organisms, which have no differentiation of structure for the performance of a variety of functions there is the non-organic tool, the stone knife, hammer, perforator, &c.

Analogous to the highly organized plants or animals, running through a series of increasing complexity, the museum of invention has its poly-organic units of technology, such are a suit of clothing, a set of tools or weapons, the house and its furniture, the shops of the artisans, the paraphernalia of a ceremony or worship.

And to perfect the comparison, the material, the pictures and descriptions to set forth the life history of a whole tribe or nation resemble very closely those studies of the best naturalists who include within the examination of a species a full description of its habits *en masse*. Such are Dr. Cook's and Sir John Lubbock's studies in ants, and such also are the ethnographic monographs sought in the little question book sent out by the British Association called "Notes and queries on Anthropological subjects."

The Smithsonian Institution itself is one of the best examples of an invention occurring to me, which actually in its life history has typed the whole series of creation very much in the same way that the embryo touches in passing every type of life below it.

On the 27th June, 1829, died at Genoa, Italy, James Smithson, natural son of the first Duke of Northumberland. Nearly three

years before his death he made a will in which, after a few small bequests, he gave to his nephew, Henry James Hungerford, the entire income arising from his property. Should the said Hungerford have a child, legitimate or illegitimate, Smithson left to such child, his heirs, executors and assigns, his estate. In case of Hungerford's dying without children he says: "I then bequeath the whole of my property to the United States of America, to found at Washington under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

This was the first vital process, the period of fructification in the ovary.

Whether in obedience to a decree of Providence or for the purpose of carrying out his uncle's wishes or because of his own inclinations, Henry James Hungerford, *alias* Henry James Dickinson, *alias* Baron Eunice de la Batut, "led a roving life in Europe and died in Pisa, June 5th, 1835, having never married and leaving no heirs who could make a claim to his bounty."

This was the second period in the metamorphosis.

On the 28th of July, 1835, Hon. Aaron Vail sent a message to the Hon. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, that the United States was entitled to the estate of Smithson, valued at one hundred thousand pounds. The Secretary told President Jackson, the President told the Senate, and his message was subsequently referred to the House. The discussion about receiving the money at all was spirited, but all shoals and reefs passed, the bill to institute a suit in Chancery to recover the money became a law, July 1, 1836.

Thus was the third period of the metamorphosis passed.

Most fortunately for the whole world the Hon. Richard Rush was appointed agent to assert and prosecute the claim. The suit was commenced in November and brought to a close in May, 1838, less than two years. When we remember that this was in a country where a "Chancery suit was a thing that might begin with a man's life and its termination be his epitaph" our admiration for Mr. Rush and the English Court needs no stimulus. In order to save the cost of exchange the agent had the fund converted into gold and silver and sent to America in the ship "Mediator."

This was the fourth period of the metamorphosis.

On December 6th, 1838, President Van Buren announced to Congress the arrival of the fund. Time will not allow me to tell of the various fortunes and misfortunes of this fund and the wranglings over it in Congress, amounting even to advice to send it back. Eight years elapsed before they came to any conclusions, and on August 10th, 1846, President Polk signed a bill organizing the Smithsonian Institution and creating a board of Regents.

Thus the fifth period of the metamorphosis.

The rest of the story can be told in a few words.

When we consider how many feeble institutions of our country that started into life with a capital of a half million are now kept from the grave by periodical stimulants, we are in a frame of mind to appreciate the magnitude of Professor Henry's appointment as the first Secretary of this trust. It was his genius that made the Smithsonian the first scientific Institution of the world. Had the regents failed here it would have been as well if Smithson had never been born.

The mission of Henry was to give genius to the enterprise, but it is well known that the diffusion of knowledge was the one dominant thought with him. Professor Henry had no notion of a Museum or of vast collections. That was a later growth. If we owe the money to Smithson, the *genius loci* to Henry, we owe the museum to Professor Baird. He was the omnivorous collector, the naturalist, the Peabody of specimens, the David of all future temple builders.

At the risk of having my motives misinterpreted by reference to the living, I should fail to do my whole duty if I did not add to the names already mentioned that of Professor G. Brown Goode, to whose genius we owe the purely educational element of our Museum, and that of Professor Langley whose studies in the New Astronomy give promise of that cheer which our Institution will in the future bestow on those who are laboring out on the very boundaries of natural knowledge.

The interpretation of Smithson's bequest, elaborated by the four men whose names I have mentioned, Henry, Baird, Goode and Langley, makes our Institution a great world university in the highest sense of the word *universitas*. The increase and diffusion of knowledge to all men so far as in us lies, the increase of knowl-

edge by the explorations of the heavens, the earth and the waters for new knowledge of all and every kind; and the diffusion of knowledge by communicating to all the researches of all, which last is only another name for increase by diffusion. The Smithsonian Institution has come to be a world university for the increase of knowledge, first, by research, second, by publication, third, by the international exchange, which I may be permitted to explain at a little more length.

For the increase of knowledge among men the Smithsonian Institution has international exchange, its publications, its library, its bureau of Ethnology and other explorations, and its museum.

By the International exchange it is the aim of our Institution to put its publications and those of the Government into every great library in the world, to place its monographs into the hands of every specialist in the world, to afford a central office through which every explorer of knowledge may speak to every other explorer of knowledge, without money and without price. By assuming this unique rôle the Smithsonian has escaped all the jealousies which would have fallen on it, had the Regents decided to enter into rivalry with universities, observatories and other established institutions, as was proposed by nearly every one to whom President Polk referred.

The exchange extends also to specimens and thus original workers may coöperate and material may be placed in the hands of those best fitted to examine it.

The publications of our Institution embrace:

I. Contributions to Knowledge, learned monographs printed in quarto form. These are chiefly philosophical memoirs rather than reports of technical work.

II. Smithsonian Reports. These contain a succinct account of the establishment for each year, with an appendix made up of scientific papers, not necessarily based on museum specimens. In recent years Part Second of this report covers the work of the National museum.

III. Miscellaneous Collections. These are specially technical, such as check-lists, taxonomic reports, bibliographies, tables, in the nature of hand-books for experts.

IV. Proceedings of the National Museum. This is our readiest medium of publication and is much like the journal of

learned societies, containing short descriptions of species, accounts of new collections and such matter as secures priority to the author and readiest knowledge to those interested.

V. Bulletins of the National Museum. These resemble very closely the series of historical papers issued by your own department of the University. Long or short, they represent concisely what the author has to say on that special theme. All of these publications and more, are sought to be deposited with institutions and men who want them. Without boasting, it may be said that the Smithsonian has to its utmost ability carried out this purpose. And you will readily see that such broadcast dissemination of scientific literature brings back from every land, from every society and from many individuals a generous response in three directions, the gift of books, the gift of pictures and the gift of things.

The Library of our establishment, therefore will consist mainly of the results of barter or exchange of kind. Whatsoever a man soweth, that will he also reap, comes literally true with us, and by every mail and express pour into our lap reports of government aid to science, Proceedings, Transactions, Journals, Reviews, Bulletins, Reports, Monographs, Zeitschriften, Mittheilungen, and what not, from every land and in every tongue. These all find lodgment in the custody of our librarian who portions them out as follows:

1. To the Sectional Libraries. These resemble precisely your Seminary library.

2. To the Library of Current Literature. This is a reading room devoted to serials where they remain until the volumes are completed, open to the public as well as to the Museum staff.

3. To the Museum Working Library. The depository of all books that are likely to be called for any day. It is a working library for the entire Institution.

4. The Smithsonian Deposit in the Congressional Library. By special act of Congress that library is the curator of our literature not immediately needed in our work.

If you will allow your imagination a little play you will see extending from the brown stone building in the mall at Washington tracks to all the centres of thought and knowledge, with tiny cars flying to and fro carrying and bringing leaves, pam-

phlets and great volumes to increase and diffuse knowledge. In reality there is once in a while friction, miscarriage, break-down, but all that is due to human weakness not the plan. If the interpretation of Mr. Smithson's bequest made by the distinguished men living and dead whom I have named could be realized, the golden rule would be in vogue among the fraternity of science and each man would be made sharer in the happiness of all.

For the accumulation of knowledge we need to explore new territory. In many departments of research we have laborers in the field. Of those I cannot speak familiarly. But in our own department of human history, I am happy to say that we have our Bureau of Ethnology, under the management of Major Powell, containing such specialists as Mallery, Henshaw, Thomas, Holmes, Dorsey and Gatschet. This Bureau has its own admirable series of Contributions, Reports, Monographs and Bulletins.

After all, the most apparent result of our system is the National Museum under the management of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution is the Director of the National Museum. Under his charge with more or less perfection of organization are twenty departments, all receiving their material through a single office of registration, all operating through the same central office of exchange, all reporting to the same director and all publishing the results of their work in the same series. It was perfectly justifiable therefore for Professor Langley to say to a distinguished visitor who asked "Do you know where to find each one of the three millions of objects under your charge?" "No, but I know where the man is who can put his hand on each specimen in some minutes."[1]

To be completely in accord with the naturalists the technographer has need to work in three directions, he must be a collector, an artist, and an author. A perfect museum of Ethnology

[1] All of the "exhibition series" in the National Museum are set up in cases which in a few moments can be rolled into the lecture room. During six months of the year public free lectures are there delivered, notable among which is the "Saturday Course," conducted by a joint commission of the scientific societies of Washington.

therefore embraces its cabinets, its portfolios, and its archives, and the curator himself must attend equally to his collecting, his picture-making, and his manuscripts.

THE STUDENT	COLLECTS	IN HIS	FOR THE GENERAL	IN THE FORM OF
I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.
Collector	Things	Cabinet	Museum	Things at rest;
Artist	Pictures	Portfolio	Gallery	Pictures and Models of things in action;
Author	Literature	Archives	Library	Description, Classification, Comparison.

Nor is it enough to collect specimens, make pictures of their parts and of their aggregations, and write an accurate description of them. A museum is composed of a vast number of things which are not only related to the men who used them and to the things in whose company they were used at home, but they are now to be correlated with other things from every quarter of the globe. The first thought that engages a curator's mind when a new thing has been properly catalogued and cared for is, where to put it. The answer to this question depends upon the classific concepts which he has previously formulated in his mind and the order in which these concepts have precedence. The major concepts governing the anthropological museums of the world are Race, Nationality, Location, Materials, Elaboration and Function. Indeed, so hopelessly are the first three confounded, that we can reduce the ruling concepts to four, Place, Material, Evolution and Function. The British Museum, the Trocadero, Stockholm, Copenhagen, Berlin, Dresden, and in our own country, the Peabody, adopt the locative concept as uppermost; while Oxford, South Kensington, Guimet, Cluny, Leipsic, and the National Museum favor the other concepts for the dominant ones. It is not to be understood that any one of these discards the ruling concept of the other, it is merely subordinated and this subordination establishes at once the tone, the genius, the total aspect of the place.

It is not necessary to enter into a discussion here of the comparative merits of administrative plans. They are all good, each bringing out phases of truth overlooked in others and it is only by a comparison of results that the whole truth may be reached.

In order to make myself perfectly clear let me take a familiar example. Suppose there comes to the Museum a harpoon, what may be done with it?

1. One curator would ask from what part of the world does it come? He desires to collate the specimen with regional questions. His concept is chorography, and when he has made his series complete he will give you a lecture on environment, showing how the suggestion of nature, like that of the hypnotist, has guided the thought of the inventor and made it impossible for him to move except in certain directions.

2. Another curator will place the same example in a series according to the elaboration of its structure. The laws of invention like the laws of evolution work from the simple to the more complex.

Mr. Tylor tells us that it is almost inconceivable for a people to abandon a useful invention unless its necessity has ceased. It is quite safe for your class in history to utilize this rule even in the study of institutions. A museum arranged wholly on this plan would resemble the one in Oxford founded by General Pitt-Rivers.

3. A third curator would take the harpoon to an alcove wherein he had determined to deposit all his possessions from a given people. His purpose is to show you how each breed of men dresses, houses, exerts, organizes itself. A perfect installation in this line would be the history of a people written in things. This is called the ethnographic method, and is most successfully carried out in Cambridge, Mass., the British Museum, Copenhagen, Dresden, and Berlin.

4. A fourth curator would say, I do not care so much about the race which used this object. My concern is with the nation whose interests it served. There are in many European capitals elegant museums organized to show the progress of art during various reigns and dynasties. The Kunstgewerbe Museum, in Berlin, adjoining the Royal Ethnographic, rivals it also in the richness of its material. There is in Copenhagen a National Gallery in the old palace of Rosenberg, through which you may walk and spend a brief time with each sovereign of the Kingdom.

5. Our wandering specimen may fall into the hands of a technologist, who will say at once whether or not the piece is in his

line. The student of naval architecture would give the harpoon away, while the Fish Commission curators would embrace it with heart-felt affection.

6. We must not forget the curator whose primal concept is substance or material. The Royal Museum of Ireland and the India Museum of London are splendid specimens of vast masses thus displayed, but you will recall at once the costly cabinets of jade, of ivory, of keramic art brought together solely to show how a definite substance has become tangled in the meshes of human history.

7. Indeed there are those who would not give a fig for the specimen if they could not get at the native name therefor. For by means of this shadowy museum of names they hope to and they do trace races, peoples over the face of the earth and establish their relationship.

Recall if you please what was said about the structure of the National Museum. It is not one but many. The division of Anthropology has its Department of Prehistoric Anthropology which you will visit with Mr. Wilson to-morrow; the section of Oriental Antiquities, and of the Historical Association; its Department of Ethnology, in which the question is one of race preëminently, and its technographic, or Arts and Industries Department, in which specimens of all the problems enumerated are wrought out so far as the material will permit.

In the musical series it will be easy to show how time or rhythm and not tune is the starting point of music. It will be easy to show how from vibratory mass, a vibrating string, a vibrating column of air, a vibrating shell, four series of melody and harmony have been elaborated.

It will be possible to see the most primitive of all devices for gathering the harvest of the waters and to follow the lines of invention up to the latest scientific appliances for deep sea dredging.

You may study at your leisure the bark-boats, the hide-boat, the raft, the dug-out as the first lesson in navigation given by Dame Nature respectively to peoples living in birch tree regions, buffalo regions, surf-beaten shores, or in the land of the knife-inviting cedar.

From this rude primary school you may see how man has worked out the hull of the Majestic, how from a grass mat to catch the wind or a rude paddle, have come the four-masted schooner and the double screw.

Only a step or two will bring you face to face with the problem of the Pullman palace train. There she stands at the other end of the series, a savage woman with a burden on her back or head, mother of Atlas and the Caryatides, pointing through the ages at beasts of burden, wagon trains and the locomotive as her offspring.

Perhaps you are an admirer of the Promethean myth or a disciple of the simple-hearted Diogenes. Follow with your eye along this series beginning with two dried sticks and ending with an electric button; beginning with a hole in the ground as in Samoa and ending with the modern cooking range of the University club; beginning with the fire-fly lamp, by the light of which, all night long, in the Dismal Swamp, an imaginary loved one in white paddles her light canoe, and ending with the incandescent burner over head.

The path along which it is possible to track the inventive genius of man into broader and smoother avenues of culture are numberless. Only a few have been wrought out in our Museums. You are doing a wonderful work in the same direction by tracing the primitive societies to their sources, for you will not find one source for all social structures any more than one source for naval architecture in the bark-boat, the skin-boat, the raft and the dug-out. Their common cause is the desire and the intention of the inventor to get across the river and the common cause of all social structures is in that unsatisfied being called man, whose superabundant brain will lead him from utter ignorance and helplessness to the possession and understanding of the earth. As fast as these processes have been unfolded our museum has endeavored to give them visible expression. Indeed we have a few choice series in which we have sealed an author's book, his pictures and his type specimens in a single cabinet that the written page may stand by the side of its material witnesses. A few of us who have loved to participate in this formative period of new historic study, with tender solicitude and great faith, will soon hand our slate and book of problems to our young successors.

The golden harvests which you will surely reap make us wish to renew our youth and thrust in the sickle. Take it from our hand, however, or rather invent a better one and go forth with our benediction. The page of history is not square but triangular. Its base is over the present, its apex a few milleniums in the past. It covered at no time all mankind, and it can scarcely be said to do so now. Outside of the area overspread by this written page lies the most territory, inhabited by unhistoric peoples. They have written not one word concerning their own affairs, and about many of them, so far remote in time or place are they, not one word has been written. These are the prehistoric and the extrahistoric races and tribes, whose lips of stone are to speak to you the story of our race.